

BULLETIN OF
THE JOHN RYLANDS
LIBRARY
MANCHESTER

Edited by the Librarian

VOL. 40

MARCH, 1958

No. 2

NOTES AND NEWS

A YEAR ago the Library launched an appeal for £100,000 to enable it to surmount the difficulties of this inflationary age and to carry on its work successfully. So far the half way mark has been reached. The second half of an appeal fund is much more difficult to raise and the Library approaches its task with some anxiety. If the multitude of scholars who have benefited directly from access to its books and manuscripts or indirectly from its publications were to contribute each a thank-offering much of the anxiety would disappear. To some of them other ways of assisting may occur. All forms of aid will be welcome and will be gratefully acknowledged by the Librarian.

We have received from Miss Janet Wadsworth the generous donation of the historical collections of her father, the late Mr. A. P. Wadsworth, formerly Editor of the *Manchester Guardian* and a Governor of this Library. Consisting of ninety manuscript volumes, 200 letters and many thousands of notes, cuttings and papers they reflect Mr. Wadsworth's keen interest in the social and economic history of Lancashire in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Included are correspondence and other records of the Rev. William Robert Hay (d. 1839), vicar of Rochdale from 1820 and Prebendary of York. Son of the Hon. Edward Hay, H.M.'s Envoy Extraordinary to the Court of Portugal, and grandson of the 7th Earl of Kinnoul, Hay is perhaps best known for his association with the "Peterloo Massacre" of 1819, for he was

Chairman of Salford Hundred Quarter Sessions from 1802 to 1823 and the leading figure on the magistrate's side in the Peterloo controversy. The collection includes some 100 letters and records, together with original placards and notices, relating to Peterloo which Hay himself assembled, as well as sixty of his own letters and papers dating from 1781 to his death. His sister married Isaac Hawkins Browne, M.P., and a smaller group consists of letters (1788-1802) to her and her husband from various correspondents, among them the Bishops of Bangor, Norwich and Oxford. A number of manuscript volumes provide valuable sources of information for the history of three Lancashire cotton firms, Messrs. Cardwell, Birley and Hornby of Blackburn (1768-1858), Nathaniel Dugdale and Bros. (1807-51) and the Ashworth (New Eagley and Egerton) Mills (1831-79). The Rochdale area is particularly well represented with five Lay Books (1774-1827), a Vestry Minute Book (1832-34) for Spotland, and many eighteenth- and nineteenth-century accounts, receipts and papers, some respecting the Dearden family, who acquired Rochdale from the Byrons. Coal mining leases and accounts of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century also occur. Not the least interesting are thirty-seven letters of Mrs. Linnæus Banks, author of the minor classic *The Manchester Man*; addressed to William Andrews of Hull they are filled with personal and literary references.

Mr. Wadsworth's own notes, numbering many thousands of items, accompany the collection. The main themes are the social, economic and industrial conditions of Lancashire, the major subjects being the Textile Industry (particularly cotton), the Sunday School movement and the history of Rochdale. In addition there are fifty-one notebooks in his hand and nineteen in other hands, the latter concerned mainly with the cotton industry from the mid-eighteenth century to the early years of the nineteenth.

A few years ago the Library acquired a considerable number (some 650 codices) of the extensive collection of manuscripts assembled by the late Dr. Moses Gaster. These were in the main Hebrew and

THE
WRITINGS OF
DR. MOSES
GASTER

Samaritan with a sprinkling of other languages. The Gaster family in addition gifted to the Library a further 123 miscellaneous manuscripts of diverse origin and character.

Dr. Gaster, by birth a Rumanian, was a versatile scholar and a prolific writer. The fruits of his labours appeared in numerous books and were also scattered widely in over sixty periodicals and books of reference. It was a happy thought of his family to have a complete collection made of all Dr. Gaster's writings and this they have now presented to the Library. It consists of some 320 printed items and over fifty manuscripts of his works, published and unpublished, in English, Rumanian, German, Italian, French and Hebrew. This ensures that in one place, at least, interested readers can find anything and everything that Dr. Gaster has written.

Dr. Gaster, in the pursuit of his Samaritan studies, maintained a close association with the Samaritan community still surviving in Nablus. Frequent letters were exchanged with its priesthood and scholars in furtherance of Dr. Gaster's desire to secure either the originals or copies of the manuscripts in their possession. The correspondence was conducted in Hebrew but written in Samaritan script. Some 500 letters have been preserved and these the Gaster family has deposited in the Library to be made available to scholars. It is hoped to give more particulars of the correspondence at some future date.

We have received the following communication from the Rev. Dr. E. Gordon Rupp, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Manchester, who has been examining the collection of Reformation Tracts deposited with us by the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres :

THE
REFORMA-
TION TRACTS
IN THE JOHN
RYLANDS
LIBRARY

"The collection of some 1,500 "Tracts by Martin Luther and his Contemporaries" owned by the Earl of Crawford and at present in the John Rylands Library represent a concentration of primary, printed sources without equal in this country. Julius Hare built his own collection of first editions of the writings of Luther, which now reposes in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, but his labour of love is far surpassed in range and richness by the Crawford collection.

"It is true that since most of Luther's works have been printed in modern times in the great folio volumes of the "Weimarana", the main interest for the research student in theology or Church History does not lie in the 500 or so tracts of Luther himself. Nonetheless, they are a wonderful collection, and it means much to a student to be able to handle these writings as they came from the original printers in Wittenberg or Leipzig or Basel or Augsburg. It enables him to grasp that prodigious intensity which enabled Luther to produce something like a tract a fortnight over twenty-five years. There is a mine of information to be gained from them by the student of printing and book production. There are many rare and striking illustrations".

"The range in date of the collection is between 1511 and 1593, though the main concentration is on the opening, formative years of the Reformation movement. The humanists, who represent perhaps the strings as against the wood-wind of the Reformers in the sixteenth-century orchestration, form an important prelude. The collection begins with two extremely rare echoes of the great "Reuchlin" controversy, the German humanist's "Entschuldigung" against his enemies, and the edition of the *Seven Penitential Psalms* which is one of the first printed books to contain Hebrew. There are some sixty writings from Erasmus, and these are of exceptional importance to the student in the absence of a modern printed collection of his works. It is not easy for the scholar to come by Erasmus's *De Libero Arbitrio*, and the *Hyperaspistes* which he wrote against Luther, which are here in their original editions. There are a few samples of the editions of the Fathers by Erasmus and Oecolampadius which show us the humanist attempt to offset the dogmatic norm of the schoolmen by the rediscovery of "the old Fathers" and, not least, of those of the East, St. John Chrysostom and the Cappadocian Fathers.

For the first twenty years of the Reformation the collection is full and massive. The important Leipzig Disputation is not only represented by Luther's pamphlets, but by important writings from John Eck and Andrew Carlstadt, the other participants in that memorable debate, and even a copy of the tedious discourse on the rules of disputation with which the Professor of Poetry, Moesellanus, inaugurated that famous summer day in 1519.

Luther's colleagues Melanchthon and Bugenhagen are represented, though not largely, in the succeeding years. More important is the collection of more than thirty tracts by Luther's former colleague and later adversary Andrew Carlstadt. Carlstadt's rather impressive lectures on Augustine's "Of the Spirit and the Letter" have been made the subject of an excellent modern edition by Kaehler, on the basis of the rare copy in this collection. Many of the other tracts are only available for the student in this country in the British Museum or in citations in the biographies of Jaeger and Barge. Only one tract of major importance, *On the Sabbath*, is missing, but the student who wishes to understand the radical pattern of puritan mysticism as it developed from 1522 onwards will find abundant material here, notably in the two writings *Of 'Gelassenheit'* and *Of the Manifoldness of the single will of God*.

"Many parts of the Reformation story have been worked over again and again, so that the research student is tempted to believe that there are not many new facts to be brought to light. This may be true, and yet there must still be rich, vividly personal material waiting in the less important, less known, less regarded, writings of the period. Thus it is in two little tracts that we catch the most vivid glimpses of Carlstadt during the Peasant War of 1525, which show him marched at pistol point between two peasant leaders, and his wife, left with the baggage and the children, submitting to search in "another part of the forest". There is the important anonymous account of Luther's famous interview with Carlstadt in the parlour of the "Black Bear" at Jena, and the very rare satirical pamphlet, which takes the form of a nuptial Mass, on the occasion of Carlstadt's marriage with the sixteen-year-old Anna von Mochau. The progress of the tracts from year to year tells important main sections of the Reformation story. There are gaps of course, and there is very little on the Strasbourg theologians (but one or two important tracts by Bucer) or on the Anabaptists, while the radicals are represented only by Thomas Müntzer's posthumously printed "Confession" and one pamphlet from Hans Denck. Yet other pamphlets, by Strauss and Urbanus Rhegius, enable us to detect the radical ferment at work, and the Crawford collection culminates with an

impressive assembly of some forty tracts from the " spiritualist " radical Caspar Schwenckfeld whose highly idiosyncratic theology roused Luther to a high pitch of vehemence. The American edition of the works of Schwenckfeld proceeds apace, but meanwhile here is a collection of writings large and important enough to enable the student to get inside the mind and mood of this oddly impressive eccentric. This is a collection of Reformation writings, mainly Lutheran, and the Catholic literature included is of use mainly to annotate Luther's own writings. But there is a very useful collection of the writings of John Cochlaeus, one of Luther's most persistent enemies, who still waits for a modern thesis to be written on him. The student of the sixteenth century, the research scholar, will find this collection an intriguing and exciting stimulus to further work, and it is to be expected that as Reformation studies become more prominent in this country, more and more people will find in these writings invaluable material for the monographs and secondary studies which will bring new perspectives to the learned world".

Acquisitions made possible by the contribution of the Pilgrim Trust to the Library's Appeal Fund include a small group of incunabula. The most interesting item is a bull of Pope Innocent VIII, *Bulla canonizationis Sancti Leopoldi Marchionis*, the work of the anonymous *Printer of the 1482 Vocabolista*, probably Stephan Koblinger, who operated the first press in Vienna. The present pamphlet (Cop. 3267 ; B.M. IA. 51508) appeared at some date after 6 January 1484/85, and is the only product of the press in the Library. It is of the issue without signature, having the woodcut initial I on fol. 1a and *nostri* correctly spelt in the last line of fol. 4b. It seems probable that this copy is one of a batch of thirty copies discovered by a German bookseller in 1926. Stitched together are copies of St. Thomas Aquinas, *De arte et uero modo praedicandi*, printed by Albrecht Kunne at Memmingen in 1483 (B.M. IA. 11024), and of Henricus de Hassia, *De arte praedicandi* (H* 8398), which has neither place nor date. From the types employed the latter would seem to have been printed by Jacobus de Breda at Deventer, probably c. 1490. The Library

PRINTED
BOOKS:
ACCESSIONS
BY PURCHASE

did not previously possess any of the early work of Kunne at Memmingen. A copy of Rampegollis, *Compendium Biblie*, printed at Cologne by Ludwig von Renchen, c. 1487 (HC* 13679; B.M. IA. 4511) appears to be the only copy recorded having three blank leaves in the last quire. It is in a half-pigskin binding with wooden boards, the ornament of which would suggest a fifteenth-century German origin. Another acquisition is *De cura pastoralis*, one of the tracts of Trithemius printed by Peter Friedberg at Mainz in 1496 (H15627; B.M. IA. 400). The work of this printer is but scantily represented in our collection. The only accession printed in Italy is an edition of Sallust, *Catilina et Jugurtha*, printed at Venice by Joannes Tacuinus de Tridino, 5 August 1493 (H14226; B.M. IB. 24021). It is a page-by-page reprint of the edition of Theodorus de Ragonibus, 9 July 1492, as far as the end of the *Catilina* (fol. 25b), and, as in that edition, the *Jugurtha* is printed in the smaller type only.

With the assistance of the same fund two small collections of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century pamphlets have been purchased at auction. They include Commonwealth tracts, Acts of Parliament mainly of the year 1657, and several pamphlets relating to the troubles in Ireland towards the end of the seventeenth century. Interesting broadsides include a copy of a *Proclamation concerning the collecting . . . His Majesties Revenue arising by fire-hearths*, 14 November 1684, (Steele 3761) printed on two folio sheets loosely stitched together in the margins between the two halves of the proclamation. This, one of the latest proclamations of the reign of Charles II, deals with the more efficient collection of hearth-tax and arrears, while a single-sheet broadside of the following February is a proclamation of the accession of James II (Steele 3764). A copy of *Two speeches* by the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Duke of Buckingham, with the imprint "Amsterdam, 1675" (W/S 2907) has an interesting link with an issue in the Spencer collection bearing the same imprint. In the Spencer copy there are some score of corrections and emendations in manuscript; in the new acquisition these have all been incorporated in the text. Among English books printed before 1640 are *A proclamation for reformation, published by Philip the Fourth, King*

of *Spain*, [1623], (S.T.C. 19844), a translation of a document issued in the early years of the King's disastrous reign, and *The Way to true Happiness*, 1613 (S.T.C. 25134). The latter, a catechetical work for the study of the Bible, was so popular that S.T.C. records ten editions with the present title and ten with an alternative title, *The doctrine of the Bible*. Eighteenth-century poetical items include Dunkin's *The Viceroy*, 1735, and the anonymous *The Hibernian politicians*, printed in the Isle of Man, 1740. This poem was issued in three parts, of which part 2 is here wanting, a duplicate of part 1 having been substituted.

A considerable personal gift, that of Miss F. E. Gresty Jackson, consists of a selection of some 200 volumes from the library of her father Francis Gresty Jackson, and was presented in his memory. Mr. Jackson was a Manchester business man who, in the latter part of the last and the early years of the present century, devoted his leisure to literary and antiquarian pursuits, and was one of the earliest readers in the Library. The volumes selected, comprising books on local history and antiquities and religious art and symbolism, form a valuable addition to the Library. Mr. Jackson was keenly interested in Grangerization and the gift includes extra-illustrated copies of *Thornbury*, *Old and New London*, extended to fourteen volumes from the original six, *Brewer, Beauties of England and Wales*, 1801-18, issued in nineteen volumes, here expanded to twenty-six, and *Baines, History of the County Palatine and Duchy of Lancaster*, edited by J. Harland, 1868-70, four volumes (published in two volumes).

PRINTED
BOOKS :
ACCESSIONS
BY GIFT

A welcome and valuable gift has been made by Mr. Charles E. Feinberg of Detroit, a distinguished collector of Whitmaniana, in honour of his friend Mr. Claude Harrison. Following a visit to the Library by Mr. Harrison to study our Whitman collection Mr. Feinberg forwarded a long list of items in his possession with an offer to present any which were not duplicates. As a result Mr. Feinberg has kindly presented twenty-seven volumes of works by and studies of Walt Whitman, many of which would not be easy to acquire in this country. They include

Specimen days and Collect, 1882-3, *At the graveside of Whitman*, edited by H. L. Traubel, 1892, several editions of *Leaves of Grass*, and an interesting collection of *100 Whitman photographs*.

The most interesting institutional gift has been that of the Manchester Grammar School, for which the department is indebted to the kindness of the High Master, Sir Eric James, a Governor of the Library. It consists of forty volumes from the school Library which, it was felt, would be more usefully placed in Rylands Library. Included are several Wing items: Bishop Stratford's *Dissuasive from revenge*, 1684 (S5933), Cowley, *Works . . . Fifth edition*, 1678 (C6653), Homer, *his Iliads*, *Translated by John Ogilby*, 1669 (H2549) and Wilkins, *A discovery of a new world, or a discourse tending to prove, that 'tis probable there may be another habitable world on the moon*, 1684 (W2186). There is also a number of books printed abroad in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including editions of classical authors which fit admirably into the great Spencer series. Among books of later date printed in England are the ten volume edition of Cicero, Oxford, 1783, Hill, *The book of nature*, 1758, and Clarke, *A survey of the Lakes*, 1789.

The following is a list of recent Library Publications, consisting of reprints of articles which appeared in the latest issue of the BULLETIN (September 1957):

RECENT
LIBRARY
PUBLICA-
TIONS

"The Fourth Gospel and the Exclusion of Christians from the Synagogues." By Kenneth L. Carroll, Associate Professor in Religion, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. 8vo, pp. 14. Price two shillings net.

"Mary Russell Mitford: The Inauguration of a Literary Career." By W. A. Coles, Instructor in English at the University of Virginia. 8vo, pp. 14. Price two shillings net.

"The Immediate Sources of the Exchequer Domesday." By R. Welldon Finn. 8vo, pp. 32. Price three shillings and sixpence net.

"The Teacher of Righteousness and the Dead Sea Scrolls." By H. H. Rowley, Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 33. Price three shillings and sixpence net.

"The Guild of St. George : Ruskin's Attempt to Translate his Ideas into Practice." By Margaret E. Spence, Lecturer in the Department of Education in the University of Liverpool. 8vo, pp. 55. Price five shillings net.

"Three Elizabethan Architects." By John Summerson, Curator of Sir John Soane's Museum. 8vo, pp. 27. Price three shillings net.

"Coptic and its Value." By Walter C. Till, Senior Lecturer in Coptic in the University of Manchester, Tit. Ao. Professor in Egyptology (Vienna). 8vo, pp. 30. Price three shillings and sixpence net.

Since the last issue of the BULLETIN the following donors have made valuable gifts of books to the Library, and to them the Governors offer grateful thanks :

PRINTED
BOOKS :
GIFTS AND
EXCHANGES

Individual Donors

Dr. Franz Babinger [3].

Dr. A. E. J. Barlow [8].

J. Barnett, Esq.

Professor H. Hale Bellot [38].

Sir George Benson, M.P.

Dr. S. A. Birnbaum.

Mrs. E. Blackman.

Mrs. W. Bromley-Davenport.

Dr. W. H. Chaloner.

J. O. Colling, Esq.

Charles E. Feinberg, Esq. [27].

Miss F. Goldstein.

Dr. A. H. Hall.

J. P. Harrison, Esq. [3].

Miss F. E. Gresty Jackson, in
Memory of her Father,
Francis Gresty Jackson [206].

Captain R. Lloyd Jones.

T. H. Keighley, Esq.

J. Baxter Lee, Esq. [3].

The Librarian.

Miss E. D. Mercer.

Dr. T. D. Mosconas.

Dr. Francis Neilson.

Dragomir Nenoff, Esq.

The Rev. Don Cleveland
Norman.

L. Picken, Esq.

Dr. Helmut Presser.

Dr. Oskar K. Rabinowicz.

The Rev. Professor H. H.
Rowley, D.D., D.Theol.,
F.B.A. [2].

Dr. G. Schlewinskzs.

R. Somerville, Esq.

Dr. B. Szcześniak.

G. Hilton-Taylor, Esq.

Miss C. G. Troulan [2].

D. O. True, Esq.

Professor Eric G. Turner.

Miss J. Wadsworth.

Miss E. Willans [4].

H. J. J. Winter, Esq.

Paul Winter, Esq.

Professor Dr. H. Wolter [2].

T. Worthington, Esq. [36].

Miss M. Yates.

Institutions

- Aberdeen University Library.
Aberystwyth : National Library of Wales [2].
Albuquerque : University of New Mexico.
American Catholic Philosophical Association.
Amsterdam : Rijksmuseum [2].
Basel University Library [21].
Beirut : American University [4].
Berlin : Staatliche Museen : Ägyptische Abteilung.
Bethel : Theologische Schule.
Beuron : Erzabtei [5].
Birmingham University Library.
British Council.
British Museum, Trustees of the [2].
Bruxelles : Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie.
Budapest : Musée Hongrois des Beaux-Arts [2].
Budapest : National Szechenyi Library [3].
Canada : High Commissioner in London [2].
Canada : Public Archives [5].
Canada : United Church : Archives Committee.
Canadian Bank of Commerce.
Centre d'Études Avancées.
Chicago : Newberry Library.
Comillas : Library of the Pontifical University [2].
Copenhagen University Library.
Cornell University Library [2].
Costa Rica University.
Darmstadt : Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung.
Dublin : National Library of Ireland.
Edinburgh University Library.
Editorial Castalia, Valencia.
Elek Books Limited.
Erlangen University Library [4].
European Movement, Bruxelles.
French Embassy, London [8].
Genoa University : Istituto di Filologia Classica.
Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte.

Ghent University Library.

Glasgow University Library.

Great Universal Stores Limited.

Halle : Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek.

Hamburg : Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek.

Helsinki : Academia Scientiarum Fennica [2].

Illinois University Library.

Jewish Statistical Bureau.

Jordan : Department of Antiquities.

Kansas University Library [6].

Kentucky University Library [6].

Lancashire Congregational Union.

Leiden University Library [10].

Leningrad : Academy of Sciences [2].

Leo S. Olschki, Editore.

Leverhulme Trustees.

Linz : Oberösterreichischer Musealverein.

Lisbon : Academia Portuguesa de Historia [3].

London : Guildhall Library.

London : House of Lords : Clerk of the Parliaments.

London : School of Oriental and African Studies.

London Symphony Orchestra, Ltd.

Louvain University Library [7].

Lund University Library [2].

Manchester Grammar School [40].

Manchester Libraries Committee.

Manchester Statistical Society.

Manchester : Town Clerk.

Manchester University Press [8].

Massachusetts Historical Society.

Michigan University Library [3].

Minnesota University Library.

Munich : Bayerische Staatsbibliothek [2].

Münster University Library [3].

National Register of Archives [192].

Newcastle-upon-Tyne : King's College Library.

Newfoundland Memorial University [4].

New South Wales Public Library.

New Zealand : High Commissioner in London.
Pan-American Union.
Paris : American Library.
Pilgrim Trust.
Reading University.
Rome : Istituto Español de Estudios Eclesiasticos.
Rome : Istituto Storico Domenicano.
Saint Andrews University Library [3].
Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Volkskunde [3].
Sheffield University.
Skoplje : Institut de l'Histoire Nationale [2].
Societas Orientalis Fennica, Helsinki [2].
Société Archéologique du Département de Constantine, Algérie.
Stanford University Library.
Stockholm : Kungliga Biblioteket.
Strasbourg University Library [2].
Toronto Public Libraries [11].
United States of America : National Archives [3].
Uppsala : University : Exegetiska Seminariet.
Uppsala University Library.
Utrecht University Library [20].
Vienna : Österreichische Akademie.
Washington : American Latvian Association.
Washington : Dumbarton Oaks Research Library.
Yale University Library [2].
Zagreb University Library.

In addition to these donations many learned societies and other bodies have continued to present copies of their periodical publications.

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE 'WAR OF THE SONS OF LIGHT AND THE SONS OF DARKNESS'¹

By K. M. T. ATKINSON, M.A.

READER IN ANCIENT HISTORY IN THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST

I. *Introductory*

THE following study sets out to be a strictly historical one, paying no attention to the particular religious beliefs of the sect with which this and the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls may have been associated. Yet it is necessary, even from this point of view, to devote some consideration at the outset to the fundamental religious outlook of the author of the *War*, since the work has been very generally classed as an "apocalyptic" one,² in the belief that it seeks to foretell the final end of the present human age, after a conflict lasting many years in which the "company of the divine" will be ranged on the side of the "Sons of Light" (i.e. the forces of Good? Or the members of the Sect and their allies?) against the "Sons of Darkness". On this interpretation, the extremely detailed character of the military arrangements

¹ No general bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls is called for here, the present purpose being to consider the *War* entirely on its own merits (see below, p. 273 f.). The work itself has been published in full, with a complete series of the fragments and a transcription, by the late E. L. Sukenik (*Oṣar ha-megilloth ha-genuzoth* (Jerusalem, 1955), with commentary in modern Hebrew). An English translation of the text is given by T. H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect in English Translation* (London, 1957), pp. 261 f., with introduction, *ibid.* pp. 257 f., and explanatory notes, *ibid.* pp. 293 f. For some views of other scholars upon the date and nature of the work see H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford, 1952), pp. 64 f. (examining earlier views); A. Vincent, *Les manuscrits hébreux du désert de Juda* (1955), pp. 154-60; G. R. Driver in the *Sunday Times* (London, August 18, 1957). On the special aspect of the *War* which is examined below, § iv (p. 290 f.) see J. G. Février, "Tactique hellénistique dans un texte de 'Ayin Fashkha'", in *Semitica*, iii (1950), pp. 53 f.

² For this reason, and in view of its cumbersome title, and to distinguish it from the *Bellum Judaicum* of Josephus where ambiguity might arise, the *War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness* will usually be referred to in this study as "the apocalyptic *War*".

prescribed in the work is somewhat surprising, and Professor T. H. Gaster, who takes this general view of its character, hardly provides a convincing explanation of the difficulty just mentioned in suggesting that men who believed that the Final Age was at hand "had to have a detailed Plan of Campaign—a kind of G.H.Q. manual for the guidance of the Brotherhood at Armageddon".¹ Other scholars, while still retaining the description of the work as an "apocalyptic" one, seem to believe that an actual historical war is referred to; thus Professor G. R. Driver, who connects the work with the Jewish Revolt of A.D. 66.² It is unnecessary to take issue over the permissible limits of the use of the word "apocalyptic", but the fundamental difference of opinion which now exists among eminent scholars as to the scope and outlook of the *War* is one which no fresh investigator can overlook. If the war contemplated by the ancient author is apocalyptic in the more usual sense of an imagined conflict with the powers of evil at the end of human time, it is virtually impossible to assign the composition of the work to any narrowly defined period, for such an idea might arise among the Jews in any age, and the work itself contains no references to individuals which might have helped to fix its date. If, on the other hand, the war in question was regarded by the author as one which would occur in the immediately foreseeable future, to be waged by Jews with definite peoples in the world around them, then it may be possible on historical grounds to discover the period in which the conditions therein implied are fulfilled.

The view now being put forward is that a predominantly human war, and that in the near future, is envisaged in the work, and passages from it which favour this interpretation will be cited in detail presently. But in pursuing the investigation along these lines it needs constantly to be borne in mind that only the internal evidence of the document actually under consideration can be taken as valid for our purpose. Since we do not yet know, even after considerable archaeological excavation of the site of their discovery, the history of the sect or community with which

¹ Op. cit. (cf. above, n. 1), p. 258. By the "Brotherhood" is meant here the sect presumed to have been established at Qumran; but see below, p. 278, n. 2.

² See Bibliography, above, n. 1.

the Scrolls were associated, it is futile to look for historical allusions in any one of them, and then to apply these to another scroll or to the collection as a whole. Yet it must be admitted that even the most distinguished commentators on the Scrolls have not always avoided this pitfall; in particular, the by now well-known figures of the "Wicked Priest" and the "Righteous Teacher" who are mentioned in several of the Scrolls,¹ but not (be it noticed) in the *War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness*, have been connected by Professor Driver and Dr. Cecil Roth with historical personage at the time of the revolt of A.D. 66, and thus have formed the starting-point of a theory that the envisaged war was that revolt itself.² This method is historically inadmissible; a sound historical approach requires rather that at this stage in our knowledge (or rather, lack of knowledge) we should assume that the Scrolls may have been composed at various and even widely-separated dates, and so should carefully avoid arguing from one to the other, unless indeed in special cases direct and close connection can be demonstrated. Incidentally, it may be remarked that the archaeological limits for the occupation of the buildings of the community with which these documents are associated (from about 135 B.C. to A.D. 68, with a break from about 31-5 B.C.)³ do not confine the dates of the documents themselves (and still less, their original composition) within this period, but would allow of some of them being earlier. The collection is essentially a *library* of manuscripts, and the evidence that copying of manuscripts went on within the building naturally would not of necessity mean that all the manuscripts found there were copied or composed on the spot, any more than this would have been the case in a medieval monastery. Moreover, if the prevailing opinion that the documents are those of a community of Essenes is correct, then we have it on the authority of Josephus⁴ that the Essenes were

¹ For details see Gaster, *op. cit.* pp. 35 f., 309 (*h*), 312, § 11.

² Expounded by Professor Driver, *op. cit.* (cf. above, p. 272, n. 1).

³ Cf. P. de Vaux in *Rév. Bibl.* (April 1954), pp. 206 f. The coins (*ibid.* pp. 229 f.) run from Antiochus VII (the earliest being of 136 B.C.) to the reign of Trajan; the period 31-5 B.C. is not represented. The building is thought to date from the reign of John Hyrcanus (133-104 B.C.).

⁴ *B.J.* II. viii. 6.

especially devoted to the study of the writings of the ancients (σπουδάζουσι δὲ ἐκτόπως περὶ τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν συγγράμματα, μάλιστα τὰ πρὸς ὠφελείαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐκλέγοντες), which admits of the possibility that the library contained not merely earlier works than the date of the foundation of this particular community, but some which were not writings reflecting the view of the Essene sect at all, being merely of interest to its members on account of their general ethical content or for some similar reason.

II. *The date of composition*

In considering the date of composition of the apocalyptic *War*, therefore, we must examine it entirely on its own merits, without preconceived ideas as to its being the work of Essenes or of any other sect, and still more without the aid of any particular theory as to the identification of those shadowy figures the Wicked Priest and the Righteous Teacher, who may indeed, as Professor Gaster has suggested, be merely stock examples of their kind, differently identified at different epochs. Yet we may think that Professor Gaster goes too far along the road to scepticism when he argues that in the text of the *War* itself allusions to the "Kittians of Assyria" and the "Kittians of Egypt" are altogether without precise significance, and can have been used, like "Hun" and "Tartar", merely to denote barbarians in general.¹ Opinions about the connotation of the term "Kittians" at various periods of Hebrew literature may vary, but clearly we have to do in this work with a period when a Syrian kingdom and an Egyptian kingdom existed as separate and still more or less equally balanced powers, so that the Jews can hope to play off the one against the other.

This situation is reflected in the opening sections of the *War* as preserved; but in order to make this quite clear it is necessary first to consider the logical implications of the first few lines of the document and their sense when read together as a whole. This raises at once a question of interpretation, and the translation proposed by Professor Gaster must be admitted to be far from satisfactory from the point of view of logic. First we are told

¹ Cf. op. cit. p. 259.

that Jewish tribes will inflict a preliminary defeat on " the troop of Edom, Moab, the Ammonites and the Philistine area, and upon that of the Kittians of Assyria, and of those violators of the Covenant who give them aid " ¹ (that is, clearly, against the Kittians who are the overriding great power and their vassals who are hostile to Israel in all the region round the east and south of the Dead Sea, and to the west of Israel itself); next, the victors are to " advance upon the [king of] the Kittians of Egypt ", who will then in turn attack the king of " Assyria " (here included, though specifically by name) among the " kings of the north ", ² with the result that " the people redeemed of God " and all the " Sons of Light " will triumph in battle over Assyria and the rest of the Kittian overlords. But this is pure nonsense; clearly the Israelites are represented in the Hebrew as assisted by the king of Egypt, not as hostile to him, and their triumph over their enemies is attributed (apart from the recognition of divine assistance) to direct Egyptian armed intervention in Palestine on their behalf. In remarking with justice that " the Kittim of Egypt do not seem (sc. in this passage) to be numbered among the enemies of the Sons of Light " ³ Professor Rowley has taken no account of the positive evidence supplied by the same passage; Egypt is here the protector and supporter of the Israelites against " Assyria " and her allies, and as for " Kittim ", it is evidently a term which will apply equally to enemies and to friends.

To the translation proposed by Professor Gaster and analysed above there are two other objections apart from the logical contradiction which it involves. The first is the meaning of the verb עלל in line 3 of the text. To interpret it as " advance upon " (i.e. " attack ") is to give to it a meaning which seems to be unattested elsewhere. ⁴ Another difficulty is the palaeographical

¹ Translation cited from Gaster, op. cit. p. 261.

² Cf. Dan. xi. 11: " And the king of the south " (i.e. of Egypt, cf. verse 8) " shall be moved with choler " (exactly as he was in the *War*, line 4, though different verbs are used in the two passages) " and shall come forth and fight with him, even with the king of the north ". The verses which follow this serve to show that, in Daniel, the reference is to a campaign earlier in date than the invasions of Egypt by Antiochus Epiphanes (from 170 B.C.).

³ Cf. Rowley, op. cit. p. 65.

⁴ This meaning is not mentioned in the *Oxford Hebrew Dictionary* (Brown, Driver, & Briggs).

one ; Professor Gaster's restoration simply of " the king " at the beginning of line 4 is too short by several letters (since it consists only of the three letters מלך) to fill the gap in the roll which occurs at this point, and further, it takes no account of the letter ה which is clearly preserved as the first letter of line 4.¹ There must therefore have been an additional word in front of מלך (itself demanded as a restoration by the verb in the singular (יָצָא) later in the same line), and this additional word which has also disappeared must have accounted for the verb יָעֲלוּ (essential meaning " enter ") at the end of line 3. Whatever this word may have been, the underlying meaning of the passage remains quite clear, as already given above ; first, the Israelites returning from exile are to win a battle in southern Palestine, which will not be in itself decisive ; next, they are to " enter (into, to ?) " the king of the Egyptians ; thirdly, he is to invade the territory of the " Assyrians " and to win a tremendous victory which will liberate the Jews. " The dominion of Assyria shall fall, with none to help her." It is to be noted incidentally that the Israelites, who already before this have won a battle in the " desert of Jerusalem " are represented as returning from exile in order to do so ; this may perhaps mean that they will already have been under the protection of the king of Egypt in Egypt itself, and after the

¹ The admirable photograph of the first fragment of the roll in Sukenik, op. cit. (cf. above, n. 1 p. 272), Pl. 16, serves as well for purposes of textual criticism as the roll itself. The text is exceedingly clearly-written and otherwise well-preserved, but at its right-hand corner, between the margin and the rest of each line down to and including line 9, a vertical strip is missing, narrower from line 6 downwards than above this point. To the right of this gap there remains in every case, in addition to the margin, either the first letter of the line or at least some vestige of it ; this enables it to be seen, in spite of slight shrinkage in the loose marginal strip, which initial letter belongs to each line, and the letter preserved on the marginal strip at the beginning of line 4 is clearly ה. In this position, followed as it is by another (noun) after the gap, the letter ה cannot be the article ; it must therefore be the initial letter of another word. The width of the gap may be estimated as having contained six to nine letters at this point (less lower down the gap ; see above). Possible restorations which would give the required sense are : ה[נפכים במלך]הכתיים (following on יָעֲלוּ מִשָּׁם at the end of line 3), i.e. " They shall enter then, turning back, to the king of . . ." (etc., cf. Judgesxx. 39 for the use of the verb הִפֵּךְ of an army turning back), or ה[לָּאָה לַמֶּלֶךְ]הכתיים, suggested by 1 Sam. x. 3, where נִשְׁמָה הָלָאָה also occurs, meaning (to go) " from thence further ". These suggestions are made merely to show that a restoration giving the required sense is possible.

initial battle withdraw again into Egypt to seek active military support from there.¹

How much historical truth is there in all this ? The question raises a fundamental difficulty of interpretation which applies to any work of prophecy, wrapped as this must always be in obscure language ; at what moment in time does the prophet stand in relation to his narrative ? It is always hard to tell at what point statement of past or present fact ends (supposing there to be any link with reality at all), and prophesy of an imagined future begins. In this case (where we are postulating as a working hypothesis some connection with historical fact), it is hard to determine whether what has so far occurred in fact is merely an initial success on the part of the Israelites, unassisted by Egypt, or whether the appeal to Egypt and her resulting intervention in Palestine has also taken place, or whether, as a remaining possibility, neither event has yet occurred, but is confidently and immediately expected by the Jews themselves. But what is certain is that the ensuing narrative from this point of the apocalyptic *War* onwards belongs to the realm of pure fantasy.

After the great defeat of Assyria with the help of Egypt, the mobilisation of the forces of the whole people of Israel² shall continue for (four more) years, making six in all (§ ii. 9), the initial battles already described having accounted as it would appear for two years. After the mobilisation is complete, a period of twenty-nine years devoted to continuous warfare will follow, the whole period making up together "the thirty-five years of labour" (שְׁנֵי הָעֶבְרָה).³ The various campaigns are specified,

¹ On the meaning of עֹל implied see also p. 283, n. 7.

² The word is 'edah, as in Num. x. 2 (of the "congregation" of all the Israelites, here organised for war) ; Exod. xii. 3 (of the Israelites setting out from Egypt at the Exodus) ; Lev. iv. 13 ("If the whole congregation of Israel sin"). It is therefore used like the corresponding Greek *demoi*, to mean the whole people of Israel assembled for whatever purpose. In the passage of the *War* here in question (§ ii. 9) Gaster (op. cit. p. 263) translates "the entire community" which he takes to mean "the Brotherhood" (i.e. the special sect connected with the Dead Sea Scrolls ; cf. op. cit. pp. 303 f.). There appears to be no justification for this limitation of the meaning of the word in the apocryphal *War*, either here or in any other passage.

³ Opinions differ widely as to the length of the prophesied war. Gaster (op. cit. p. 293, n. 10) says it is to last forty years, and of the "year of release" (שְׁנַת הַשְּׁמִטָּה) referred to in § ii. 6, that "the release occurs at the end of every seventh

viz. *First Year*, against Mesopotamia; *Second Year*, against the "Lydians";¹ *Third Year*, against "the rest of the Syrians" which are across the Euphrates", that is, on its western side;² *Fourth and Fifth Years*, against "Arpachshad";³ *Sixth and Seventh*, against "all the Assyrians, Persians, and Easterners as far as the Great Desert"; *Eighth*, against the Elamites; *Ninth*, against "the descendants of Ishmael and Keturah" (i.e. the Arabian nomads);⁴ then for ten years against the Hamites (i.e. in Ethiopia, Egypt, Somaliland or Punt);⁵ lastly, for the remaining ten years, against some other people whose name has been lost. For reasons to be considered later,⁷ it seems most probable that the missing name here is that of the "Kittians of the Sea" (or some such term) to denote the Macedonians.

But what is significant in all this is that conquest of a great earthly kingdom is envisaged, extending over the whole of the eastern world (including part of north-east Africa) of which the

year, and lasts for one year". Driver, on the other hand (cf. p. 272, n. 1) thinks that the war is to last seven years, connecting this with the outside limits of the Jewish Revolt (A.D. 66-73). Neither view accounts for the arithmetical data given in the text itself (see above), nor, in the case of Gaster's interpretation, for the clear statement in the passage in question that once it begins, fighting in the first and all subsequent years down to and including the ninth is to be continuous. The view here being adopted is that the thirty-five years are divided as $2 + 4 (= 6 \text{ years of mobilisation}) + 9 + 10 + 10$ (the 29 years of continuous fighting). The check on this is provided in § ii. 6: "For the remaining thirty-three years of the war" (i.e. after the "release"), the number 33 being obviously arrived at as $29 + 4$, not as $40 - 7$.

Thus the "sabbatical rest" (§ ii.9) which is to follow immediately on the "release" (השמטה) must either be interpreted (as often) simply as a rest-period, without reference to an interval of six years preceding it, or it must have been regarded by the ancient author of the *War* as coinciding (perhaps only by anticipation) with one of the existing series of Jewish sabbatical years (cf. Lev. xxv. 2-4, etc.) of which one was the Seleucid year 150 (163/2 B.C. (cf. 1 Macc. vi. 49)).

¹ Certainly not the people of that name in western Asia Minor, but the "Children of Lud" included among the Semites in Gen. x. 22.

² This seems to imply a date in the Seleucid period.

³ Apparently a reference to the (Persian) satrapy of "Across the River" (cf. Ezra vi. 6, etc.).

⁴ Cf. Gen. x. 24, 1 Chron. i. 17 (known only as a "son of Shem"). But no chronological conclusions can be drawn from this. The name continued in use among the Jews in the Maccabaeian period (1 Macc. vii.8).

⁵ Cf. Gen. xxv. 1-5, 13-18.

⁶ Cf. Gen. x. 6.

⁷ See below, p. 282 f.

Jews in ancient times had any knowledge. The excited imagination of the writer depicts the triumph of the Chosen People, with the help of their God, but at the outset also with the help of the king of Egypt, as breaking loose from temporal bondage to the king of (the geographical area) Syria, and as destroying in the long run not only their direct oppressors, but even the empire of the Egyptian king as well. Even so might a disciple of the Prophet have envisaged the eventual earthly triumph of Islam.

That "Assyria" in this Dead Sea Scroll stands, as in other Jewish writings, not for the Assyrian kingdom but for the Seleucid Empire,¹ is certain for two reasons. In § xii of the work itself a significant Greek loan-word occurs (*heret* with the otherwise unknown meaning of "written document")²; and secondly, as I shall demonstrate later in this study, the influence of Greek writers of *Tactica* is clearly traceable³ both upon the conception of the work as a whole and in the elaboration of its detail.

The struggles between Egypt and Assyria in the seventh century B.C. (which at least require to be mentioned for the sake of logical completeness) can therefore be ruled out of account; in the Saite period the other conditions required might conceivably be fulfilled in Egyptian relations with the Neo-Babylonian empire, but no Greek *Tactica* had yet been written; throughout the whole of the Persian (Achaemenid) period the Jews were basking in the favour of their Persian overlords (if these might

¹ The point has been much disputed. Rowley (op.cit. p. 65, n. 1) cites as a possible parallel Ps. lxxxiii. 6-8 (which he attributes to "the Maccabaeen age") noting also the resemblance to the grouping of peoples (Edomites, etc.) in the *War*, § i. As additional evidence may be cited Ezra vi. 22, where the king of Persia is called "the king of Assyria", clearly in reference to his overlordship of the geographical area Syria (including Judaea). Cf. also Isa. xix. 23, "a highway out of Egypt into Assyria", which must have been understood by Jews of the Maccabaeen period in Egypt, who cited this passage as a justification for the foundation of the new temple at Leontopolis (Joseph., *A.J.* xiii. 2; see further below, p. 289), as referring to Syria.

² I.e. *χαρτη*(s), common in this sense in papyri of the third century B.C. onwards (cf. Preisigke, *Wörterb. Griech. Papyr.*, s.v.). Gaster (op. cit., p. 296, n. 59) notes that the word is otherwise known only from Ex. xxxii. 4, there meaning "graving tool"; his own translation in *War* § xii is "charter", but he does not suggest a Greek derivation.

³ See below, p. 290 f.

conceivably be described as " Assyrians "),¹ and in any moment of Persian weakness were suffering oppression at the hands of the Egyptians ;² this reverses the situation depicted in the *War*.

Only with the re-emergence of separate kingdoms of Syria (" Assyria ") and Egypt upon the break-up of Alexander's empire do the fundamental conditions postulated in the *War* once more exist, and then only for a relatively short period, in the first half of the second century B.C.

On a preliminary view, indeed, the years before Ipsus might also enter into consideration, since Antigonus (the One-Eyed) and his son Demetrius Poliorcetes were then in control of Syria and were contesting the possession of Palestine with Ptolemy Soter ; at that time they could well be described as " the kings of the north ", in contrast to Ptolemy as " king of the south ". Since Antigonus' capital was at Babylon until 312 B.C. his realm could also quite appropriately be referred to in a Jewish work as " Assyria ". The kingdoms of Syria and Egypt were still separate, and by this time Greek tactical manuals were already in existence, though it certainly seems unlikely that before the great development of Alexandria there would be Jewish writers likely to interest themselves in them. But the conclusive argument against ascribing the apocalyptic *War* to this period is that, just as in the Persian period, the situation depicted in the *War* is reversed so far as the Jews are concerned ; they are not calling in the aid of Egypt against Syria, but on the contrary are supporting Syria (Antigonus) against Egypt. For when Ptolemy seized control of Syria, with Judaea, in 312 by the battle of Gaza (to hold it until the tables were turned by Demetrius in the campaign of 306), he took back with him into Egypt the High Priest " Ezekias " (who thus became, through a Greek writer, the ultimate source of much of Josephus' information about Jewish ceremonial and other matters in this period)³ and a number of other prominent Jews. The Alexandrian Greek writer Hecataeus who recorded this said indeed that the Jewish priest followed Ptolemy back to Egypt " because they had learnt of his mildness

¹ Cf. Ezra. vi. 22 (cited above, p. 280 n. 1).

² Cf. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923), no. 30 (408 B.C.).

³ Cf. Joseph, c. *Apionem*, l. 22.

and clemency", but this is obviously the pro-Ptolemaic version; the real motive of Ptolemy was clearly to treat these distinguished Jews as hostages for the good behaviour of the rest of Judaea in his absence, and at the same time to remove the element most likely to stir up revolt against him. After the battle of Ipsus in 301, and throughout the third century B.C., when they were in effective control of Judaea (and this in spite of the numerous "Syrian Wars"), the Ptolemies naturally did their best to propitiate Jewish opinion, but an insurmountable objection to placing the composition of the apocalyptic *War* within this period is that it represents "the Assyrians" or "kings of the north" (*War*, § 1) as in control of Judaea.

However, in 201 B.C., Antiochus III at the battle of Panion in Syria defeated Ptolemy V and annexed Coele Syria, thereby making the whole of Judaea subject to the Seleucids. This continued to be the position as far as the Jews were concerned until they succeeded in throwing off the Syrian yoke in the revolt which began in 166 B.C.¹ The period 201-166 B.C., perhaps extended for a few years while the outcome of the revolt was still uncertain, would therefore seem to be the one in which alone the Jews could consider themselves as under Seleucid domination, even though actual political independence, conceded by Syria, was only achieved with the founding of the Hasmonaean dynasty by the High Priest Simon in 143/2 B.C. (Seleucid year 170). Twenty years before this final result (cf. 1 Macc. vii. 1 and viii. 1 f.) the situation was complicated by the alliance concluded between Judas Maccabaeus (two years before his own death in battle) and Rome; it is therefore worthy of remark that the author of the apocalyptic *War* gives no hint whatever that Rome was a power in the east Mediterranean, and still less in the world of Asia in general. For this reason alone it is out of the question that the date of the work can be brought down into the next period of foreign domination over Judaea, namely that of Rome which began in 63 B.C.; and it would seem unlikely that once the Maccabees had decided that Rome and not Egypt was the power on which it would be best to lean, the situation depicted at the

¹ The era of the Maccabees begins 24 November 166 B.C.

beginning of the apocalyptic *War*¹ would arise ; it would belong not to the prophesied future, but already to the past.

There are other strong reasons for rejecting any part of the Roman period in Judaea as a possible date for the composition of the *War*. The uninterrupted struggles of internal factions in Judaea itself for at least a generation after the Roman annexation preclude us from connecting with this period a work which was so clearly called forth by a sense of national unity in the face of the hated foreign oppressor.² In 30 B.C. the annexation of Egypt by Rome introduces a new factor which makes the attribution of the work to this time even more conspicuously impossible ; the apocalyptic *War* requires, as we have seen, that Syria (with Judaea) and Egypt should be ruled at the time by two separate and conflicting powers.³ But this condition was never again to be fulfilled throughout the period of the Roman Empire. In any case the military arrangements described in the work are, as I shall demonstrate more fully later,⁴ quite incompatible with the ascription of a late Roman, and still less a Byzantine date to the work. Of the arguments just mentioned, the one which quite apart from all others rules out of account the time of the revolt of A.D. 66⁵ is that Syria and Egypt were then both under the single power of Rome ; and this is true even if we take " Rome " in practice to mean Vespasian as commander of the Jewish war, either before or after his assumption of the imperial power. And in fact, the scholars who now put forward the theory here in question have sought to support it by the methodologically unsound use of passages cited from others of the Scrolls which may well have nothing to do with the circumstances alluded to in the apocalyptic *War*.⁶

At the other end of the chronological scale, there are striking similarities both in exact words and in sense to the book of Daniel,⁷ which might seem to perhaps the majority of scholars,

¹ See above, pp. 275 f.

² For the same reason (cf. Joseph. *B.J.* i. 15.5 f.), and also in view of its extremely transitory nature, the Parthian invasion of Judaea and the rest of Syria in 40 B.C. cannot be connected with the " Kittians of Assyria " who are the foreign oppressors in the apocalyptic *War*.

³ See above, pp. 275 f.

⁴ See below, pp. 290 f.

⁵ See above, p. 274.

⁶ See above, p. 273.

⁷ Cf. p. 276, n. 2. The question also arises whether the verb עלל in *War* § i. 3 is used technically, as in Dan. ii. 16, 24 (though here in Aramaic), of entering into negotiations with (the king). Cf. above, pp. 277 f.

once they have been pointed out, to fix Antiochus Epiphanes' desecration of the Temple in 167 B.C. as the *terminus post quem* for the composition of our *War*. However, since the interpretation of the historical setting of the book of Daniel raises special problems of its own, and since in any case some doubt is bound to arise as to which of the two works was influenced by the other, it seems desirable as a further step towards defining the date of the apocalyptic *War* to consider first in outline the position of the Jews in relation to their Seleucid overlords in the generation which followed the Seleucid annexation in 201 B.C. and preceded the Maccabean revolt. The state of affairs implied by the *War* is one in which the Jews have not actually attained independence, but in which they have good hopes of doing so. If it falls within these limits at all, this implies a date much nearer the end than the beginning of the period 201-167 B.C. Under the strong rule of Antiochus III (who is no doubt the 'fourth king' referred to in Dan. xi. 2 f.), Seleucid defeats occurred only in the western parts of his empire with which the Jews had no concern, and became manifest only about the time of his death (Treaty of Apamea, 188 B.C.). A Jewish revolt during his reign would have been inconceivable, and Ptolemaic intervention in Palestine no less so, in view of the internal weakness of the "kingdom of the south" at that time. During the next few years after Antiochus' death in 187 B.C., Ptolemy V (d. 180 B.C.) improved his position in Egypt itself by driving out barbarian invaders and suppressing native revolts. The contemporary king of Syria, Seleucus IV (187-175 B.C.), maintained foreign alliances which coincided with those of Ptolemy,¹ but at the time of his death in 180 the Egyptian king is said to have been preparing for an invasion of Coele Syria.² Conceivably then the hopes of the Jews of Judaea may have begun to be aroused about this time, especially if it is true that Seleucus IV, very near the end of his own reign, made an abortive attempt to confiscate the Temple treasure.³ In any case the anti-Jewish policy of the next king of Syria, Antiochus IV

¹ Cf. Polyb. xxii. 12.

² Cf. Hieron. *ad Daniel*. xi. 20.

³ Cf. 2 Macc. iii. 3 f. The same work (*ibid.* iii. 3) says that this king had hitherto been tolerant of the Jew and their temple. It is, however, wise not to lay too much stress on evidence derived from 2 Maccabees, which differs conspicuously in respect of its reliability from 1 Maccabees.

(Epiphanes) may well have begun to show itself right from the beginning of his reign (175 B.C.), so that the Jews can have begun dreaming of liberation, with Egyptian help, some years earlier than Antiochus' actual suppression of the rights of the Temple in 167 B.C.¹

So far then we seem to have narrowed down the date of composition of the apocalyptic *War* to between 175-c. 160 B.C., though a date between 175-167 implies that its composition preceded that of the book of Daniel, which alludes to the desecration of the Temple; this seems difficult.² Moreover, a point which seems to imply a date after the formal beginning of the Maccabaeen Era in 166 B.C. needs to be noticed, though too much insistence cannot be placed upon it. It may be asked (though without any hope of a very clear answer) why the author of the *War* supposes that the total length of the War of Liberation will be thirty-five years.³ A plausible answer (one would put it no higher) is that the seer, recollecting that the period of Seleucid domination had lasted precisely this length of time (201-166 B.C.), prophesied that the process of getting free from their yoke would last exactly as long.⁴

Another significant point is the apparent allusion in the work (§ ii. 9) to a Jewish sabbatical year as about to occur in the second

¹ See also below, p. 289.

² In view of the fact that in the book of Daniel allusions to the "king of the north" and "king of the south" are much more explicit, and might seem to be the source of the reference in the *War* (cf. p. 276, n. 2).

³ Cf. p. 278, n. 3.

⁴ It may further be noticed that it has been suggested by Professor H. H. Rowley (op. cit. pp. 67 f.) that the Righteous Priest named several times in the *Zadokite Document*, and also in others of the Dead Sea Scrolls, is to be identified with the High Priest Onias, who was put to death in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc. iv. 1-36). The date of his murder cannot be determined exactly, but appears to belong to about 170 B.C. Thus it may be possible to associate closely with the apocalyptic *War* the passage in the *Zadokite Document* (§ vii. 20a) which prophesies a struggle lasting "about forty years from the death of the Teacher of the Community" (cf. Gaster, op. cit. p. 82). The "forty years" would on this view be arrived at by adding to the "thirty-five" of the *War* the five years which elapsed from the death of Onias until the war of liberation began. But since the theory of the "thirty-five years" may have been expressed also in works other than the *War*, it would be unsafe to conclude that the *War* was written earlier than the *Zadokite Document*. Both would appear, however, to have been written at much the same time.

year of the projected war.¹ Since the year 163/2 B.C. is shown by a reference in the historically reliable 1 Maccabees to belong to this series,² the actual composition of the apocalyptic *War* may belong to the very beginning of the Maccabean revolt, to 165 or 164 B.C., thus coinciding exactly in date with the book of Daniel. It is further to be remarked that precisely in 164/3 B.C. there occurred the great dynastic crisis in Egypt between Ptolemy VI and his brother Ptolemy VII which may well have put an end to any hopes entertained by the Jews that Ptolemy VI would forthwith invade Syria to avenge the recent invasions of his own kingdom by Antiochus IV.

So much for the chronological data which can be used in dating the time of composition of the apocalyptic *War*. It is now time to turn to other aspects of the work which may also have an indirect bearing on the time of its composition.

III. *Where was the War composed?*

According to the view now being put forward (and so far as I am aware, not previously suggested), the work was composed by a member of a Jewish community in Egypt who regarded themselves as in exile. The evidence for this conclusion (which should not in itself seem at all surprising, in view of the long history of Jewish settlement in Egypt) is the use of the Egyptian solar calendar which the apocalyptic *War* unequivocally implies. Since the fact does not appear to have been recognised hitherto, I quote the relevant passage in full, from Professor Gaster's translation:³ “. . . (lacuna)—fathers of the community,⁴ fifty-two in number. After the High Priest and his deputy they shall appoint an order of major priests, twelve in number, to serve constantly before God. Furthermore, twenty-six major officials duly assigned to service shall serve in their appointed offices; and after them shall be twelve major levites, one for each tribe, to serve constantly. The major officials charged with service shall serve in rotation, but subordinate to them shall be the chiefs of the tribes and the fathers of the community stationed constantly

¹ Cf. p. 278, n. 3, *ad fin.*

² *Ibid.*

³ *Op. cit.* p. 262 f.

⁴ Hebr. עֲדָה, not necessarily referring to a small sect. See above, p. 278, n. 2.

at the gates of the sanctuary. The major officials shall take up their positions, in discharge of their duties, on the festivals, new moons, sabbaths, or weekdays duly assigned to them." (More detailed regulations follow.)

To note first an incidental point, the references to the "constant service" recall a remarkably similar phrase in St. Paul's allusions to the traditional orthodox service of the Temple (Acts xxvi. 7: τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν ἐν ἑκτενείᾳ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν λατρεῖν) and warn us against regarding this passage in the *War* as in any way mystical.

Professor Gaster makes the comment that the fifty-two "fathers of the community" imply one for each week in the year, and further notes that the "twenty-six" who are to serve in rotation "correspond to the twenty-four of normal Jewish usage".¹ His conclusion about the significance of the number fifty-two here is made the more probable by the commandments concerning the Temple-service in the books of Numbers (xxviii. 10 f.) and 1 Chron. (ix. 31 f.), where also the Levites specially set aside for regular sabbath-day offerings and other services are described in familiar phrase as "heads of the fathers' houses of the Levites". These may very well correspond to the "fathers of the community" of our text. But a very pertinent point which must not go unnoticed is that in the normal Jewish year, which continued to be a lunar one throughout their history until at least as late as the time of the revolt of A.D. 66, there can never have been fifty-two weeks or fifty-two sabbaths. Fifty-two weeks are inseparably connected with the *solar* year. But in pre-Roman antiquity there was only one country in the civilized world which used the solar calendar, namely Egypt, where it had been in use from time immemorial. Only under Egyptian influence was it first introduced into Italy by Julius Caesar in 46 B.C., and even then the eastern provinces of the Roman empire continued to use the old (Macedonian) lunar calendar, with the single exception of the province Asia, where the solar calendar was introduced by the Romans some time during the reign of Augustus.² It is

¹ Op. cit. p. 293, notes 7 and 8.

² Cf. Ehrenberg and Jones, *Documents illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (edn. 2, 1955), no. 98.

unnecessary to labour this point, which is well known to all scholars who have concerned themselves with Hellenistic history.¹ The sole doubt which may remain is whether the Ptolemies introduced the solar calendar in any of their external possessions, as for example in Cyprus, the Cyrenaica, or Judaea in the third century B.C. But it seems clear that in this period they adopted a policy of conciliation to the Jews, and are therefore most unlikely to have introduced in Judaea itself an innovation which would certainly have been bitterly resented by the Jews. As against the possibility that the solar calendar was introduced at this time into other Ptolemaic dominions, we have to remember that the Ptolemies had to consider also the susceptibilities of their Greek subjects, who after all were the governing class everywhere, and *their* traditions also bound them to the lunar calendar. It is significant that in the Greek cities of Ptolemaic Egypt itself, Alexandria, Ptolemais, and Naucratis, the old Macedonian lunar months continued to be used right through into the second century A.D. and later.² The place of composition of the apocalyptic *War* seems therefore to be narrowed down to one of the towns of Egypt which lay outside the boundaries of the three Greek cities just mentioned; we must presume it to have been an urban centre both on grounds of general probability and because, as we shall see, there is good reason to think that the author had a library containing Greek works at his command.

The town which most naturally suggests itself for the place of composition of the *War* is the Jewish "city of Onias",³ founded with a new Jewish temple of its own a few years before the beginning of the Maccabean revolt, and in memory of the recent

¹ For details of the system see Parker and Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology*, 625 B.C.—A.D. 45 (edn. 2, 1953). It is now known also that the Persian (Achaemenid) months corresponded exactly with the Babylonian ones in all but in name. See further R. Kent, *Old Persian Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*, (edn. 2, 1953), p. 161, giving Old Persian, Elamite and Akkadian equivalents for the lunar months. Cf. also Esther viii. 9 (use of Babylonian month-names in the Persian satrapies). The Macedonian Successors adopted in the various kingdoms the same lunar system, merely assigning Macedonian names to the months.

² Cf. e.g. Dittenberger, *Orientalis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae*, no. 56 (239/8 B.C.), line 2, etc.; no. 703 (147/8 A.D.), line 5.

³ Called *πολίχνη* in Joseph., *B.J.* i. 1.1.

martyr, the former High Priest Onias.¹ Succeeding to a ruined Egyptian temple-site near Heliopolis in the Delta, the Jews were here in a region which had hitherto been purely Egyptian ; and since the building of a temple at all outside Jerusalem was an astonishing departure from their former religious tenets, they would hardly boggle at the accommodation of their existing Jewish calendar to the framework of the Egyptian solar year which had always obtained in this region. This after all is the normal procedure of Jewish communities at the present time in Europe.

The view that this was the Jewish community in which the apocalyptic *War* was written has the following additional arguments in its favour : first, the temple at Leontopolis in the Heliopolite nome was to be a religious centre for *all* the Jews settled in Egypt (Joseph., *A.J.* xiii. 1). Secondly, the reigning Ptolemy " at the time when Antiochus made war upon the Jews " (*B.J.* vii. 10.2) provided the new Jewish temple with lands and revenues in money sufficient to maintain it (*ibid.* 3) ; this may well have encouraged the Jews in Egypt to believe, as the author of the apocalyptic *War* evidently did,² that within a few years the king of Egypt would assist the insurgents in Judaea by invading Coele Syria in force. It is to be noticed incidentally that the date for the foundation of this temple is given by Josephus (*B.J.* vii. 10.4) as the equivalent of 1710 B.C.,³ so that he implies that the hostilities of Antiochus Epiphanes against the Jews began some years before the desecration of the Temple at Jerusalem in 167 B.C. Thirdly, the new Jewish temple in Egypt was closely connected with a fortress (*φρούριον*) and⁴ was itself built in the form of a tower (*πύργω παραπλήσιον*) ;⁵ another Jewish encampment which went by the name of *Ἰουδαίων στρατόπεδον* was not far away in the Delta,⁶ and the assistance given by the king

¹ Not actually by Onias himself, as implied by Josephus in *B.J.* i. 1.1 ; vii. 10.2 f., since this contradicts not only 2 Macc. iv. 33 f., but the later account of the founding of the same temple by Josephus himself in *A.J.* xiii. 3.1-3, where it is ascribed to the son of Onias the High Priest, who bore the same name as his father.

² See above, p. 277 f.

³ Actually as " 343 (*leg.* 243) years " before its destruction by the Romans in A.D. 73.

⁴ *B.J.* vii. 10.3.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Cf. *B.J.* i. 9.4 ; *A.J.* xiv. 8.2.

towards the building of the temple itself was in return for the promise of future military support.¹ This was indeed a not unreasonable form of agreement for Ptolemy VI to make, harassed as he was both by invasions from Syria (in 170, 169 and 168 B.C.) and by revolts within his own kingdom. All this would form a very natural background for the military and militant character which is so conspicuous, and would otherwise seem so remarkable, a feature of the apocalyptic *War*.²

IV. *The debt of the author of the War to a Greek military manual.*

It has already been suggested by J. G. Février in an interesting discussion of one particular passage in the apocalyptic *War* (§ viii. 2 f.; Gaster, op. cit. p. 270, following the asterisks) that the details of the drawing-up of troops in battle-formation given in the *War* correspond exactly to those in use both in the Maccabaeon period and at the very end of the third century B.C.³ If this is true, the conclusion agrees perfectly with those already reached earlier in the present study. But the matter is complicated by a problem which the writer of the article does not take into account; it is possible that the ancient author, being himself no tactician, has simply utilized for his own purpose some published work on tactics. It would make the present investigation of the historical setting of the apocalyptic *War* unduly long to include within it a technical study of the kind which would be needed to establish this conclusion finally.⁴ I shall therefore confine myself here to a brief general survey which at least points to its probability.

The general conclusion which emerges from a close examination of the work is that its author is certainly indebted in no small

¹ B.J. vii. 10.10.2: ἔφη (δ' Ονίας) σύμμαχον αὐτῷ ποιήσειν τὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος, εἰ πεισθείη τοῖς ὕπ' αὐτοῦ λεγομένοις.

² Is it possible that the same explanation applies to the "camps" of the Community referred to in the *Zadokite Document* (§ xii, 22 f., Gaster, op. cit. pp. 89 f.)? The contrast between these and the "city" or "cities" mentioned in the same document (§ x, 14 f., Gaster, op. cit. pp. 86 f.) could also apply to the Jewish colony in Egypt in its concentrated form, as established by Ptolemy VI, the "camps" being outlying Jewish-manned garrisons.

³ Cf. *Semitica*, iii (1950), pp. 53 f.

⁴ I have in preparation a more detailed study of this subject.

measure to the Scriptures ; this indeed we should expect. But at the same time he has drawn largely upon *Greek* tactical manuals of the kind which began to be produced from the end of the fifth century B.C., under the influence of the Athenian sophists and of Socrates. I shall begin by elaborating these two points.

In the first place, the great prominence given in the *War* to military standards and the inscriptions on them, though referred by some modern commentators to a conscious parallel with Roman usage,¹ is surely due, not so much to the vague and general "in the name of our God will we set up our banner" of Ps. xx. 6,² as to Numbers ii. 2 f. "The Children of Israel shall pitch every man by his own standard (דגל), with the ensigns (אֶתֶת) of their fathers' houses . . .", and similarly later (*ibid.* x. 18, etc.), referring to the standards (דגליִן) of the various tribes, to each being attached (whether on the *degel* itself or not is not made clear, but the author of the *War* seems so to understand it), a roll of the numbers of men in each of the tribal contingents, with the actual names of their commanders.³ It is to be noted that the two words used for the standards in the book of Numbers also recur in the *War*, and also that the work includes (§ x) a direct quotation from Numbers (x. 9 : "when ye go to war in your land against the adversary that oppresses you, then ye shall blow an alarm with the trumpets ; and ye shall be remembered before your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies").

The author of the *War* thus depicts standards which (in the case of those of the "thousands" and of the "hundreds") are inscribed with at least eleven names, as well as with the mottoes on each ("Praises of God on the ten-stringed harp" and the like). There is no evidence that the Roman standards (*signa*) or flags (*vexilla*) ever had any longer an inscription than the name of the regimental unit itself, and that in an abbreviated form ;⁴ on the *signa* there was no room for more,⁵ and on the *vexilla* the main device was a conspicuous embroidered figure of some kind.⁶

¹ Cf. Gaster, *op. cit.* p. 294, n. 29.

² Cited by Gaster, *ibid.*

³ Cf. the similar passage in Numbers, x. 14, 18, 22, 25.

⁴ Veget. ii. 13.

⁵ Dar.-Sagl., *Dict. des Antiq. Grecques et Romaines*, s.v. *signa*, p. 1314 and Fig. 6424.

⁶ *J.R.S.* xxxii (1942), pp. 92 f.

This indeed was necessary if the standard or flag was to serve its purpose of rallying the troops to the regimental colours in battle.¹ A mere list of names, even with a written motto attached, would be useless for this purpose. It is therefore pointless to cite the Roman standards of any period as a parallel;² and what is more, our author stands revealed even at this stage in the inquiry as a mere literary writer, with no claim at all to practical military knowledge.

Another indication of the author's use of scriptural sources is the term *אנשי הבינים* to indicate a special class of troops (§ viii. 3 etc.). From its meaning ("between-men") Février³ wishes to connect it with the Greek peltasts, intermediate between the heavy hoplites and the light-armed, who were still in use in the second century B.C. But the translation "heavy infantry"⁴ is much to be preferred, because the same word is used in 1 Sam. xvii. 4, 23 of the "champion" Goliath, whose overthrow is referred to later in this same work, and whose great weight of body-armour and weapons (xvii. 5) makes him comparable to the heaviest hoplites of Greek armies. The use of this term in the *War* therefore gives no more indication of its date of composition than does the description of the standards; conceivably it might apply just as well to troops armed like the Roman legionaries. It may also be remarked that the same observation applies to the "tens", "hundreds", "fifties", and "thousands", into which the Jewish forces are to be divided. These names are universal in antiquity for all peoples and all periods down to and including the Hellenistic and the Roman of the first century A.D.; the writer of the *War* is no doubt following scriptural precedent (1 Chron. xiii. 1, xxviii. 1, etc.) rather than any historical parallel known to him from other sources.⁵

Similarly again with military use of trumpets as represented in the *War*; we can naturally find both Hellenistic and Roman

¹ Vegetius (*ibid.*) notes that this was its function.

² As has been suggested by Gaster (*op. cit.* p. 259, referring to the passage of Vegetius mentioned above, p. 291, n. 4).

³ *Op. cit.* p. 56.

⁴ Gaster, p. 270, etc., translates simply "infantry".

⁵ The Aramaic papyri of the Jewish colony in Egypt in the fifth century B.C. provide a well-known instance; cf. Cowley, *op. cit.* nos. 2, 3, 22, 26, 80 ("hundreds"), 71 ("thousands").

parallels, but for this particular Jewish author the "trumpets of assembly" (צוצורות המקרא, § viii. 3 etc.) are likely to be suggested by the צוצורת...למקרא העדה of Num. x. 2¹ and elsewhere. But perhaps the great elaboration of the use of trumpets described in his work may be due, together with other features, to the influence of Hellenistic tactical manuals.

We now turn to this other main source of the author's material. And first, the general nature of the contents of the work (apart from its prophetic sections, which after all form but a small, though a significant part) and its whole arrangement are strongly reminiscent of systematic Greek treatises on the military art from Aeneas Tacticus (the earliest of these writers whose work has survived)² onwards. The Greek treatise which shows the clearest resemblance to the military sections of the apocalyptic *War* is that of Asclepiodotus, who wrote about 100 B.C., but certainly followed very closely earlier handbooks on the same lines, and was in his turn to be utilized by tactical writers of the second century A.D. and later.³ Thus the date of Asclepiodotus himself is irrelevant to the question of the date of the *War*; for the present purpose the content and form of his treatise alone concern us. In these respects it may be said to be typical of the systematic Greek technical treatises of every kind, on medicine, mathematics, music, agriculture, horsemanship, etc., which had their origin in the inquiries of Socrates and the sophists at the end of the fifth century B.C. It sets forth in great detail, and for the most part under specific headings, directions for dealing with the various practical problems which generals and officers will have to meet in battle, on the march, and in camp. Examples of such "chapter-headings" (which are conspicuously absent from purely literary Greek works) are § iv "Concerning Intervals", § v "On the Character and approximate Size of Arms", § vi "On light Infantry and Targeteers", § vii "On the Cavalry", § xii "On the Terms used for Military Evolutions". Similarly, the

¹ Cf. above, p. 291; the *War* directly cites this chapter of Numbers.

² On this class of works in general see the introduction by W. A. Oldfather to the Loeb edition (1948) of the works of Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus and Onasander.

³ The reader is referred to the long series of studies of the Greek tactical writers by A. Dain.

apocalyptic *War* has a special section (with its appropriate heading) on the Cavalry (§ vi. 7-17; Gaster, op. cit. p. 268), and many other comparable sections with special headings occur; thus in § iv "Order of the Standards of the Community",¹ § v "Order of deploying the Battle-squadrons when their full force is mustered",² or a still more explicit and lengthy heading referring to the use of the various kinds of trumpet-signals.³

Asclepiodotus is typical of the Greek tactical writers in general from Aeneas Tacticus (about 350 B.C.) onwards in using these headings. But surely this is a precise and systematic form of exposition quite foreign to Jewish writers (and above all to writers of apocalyptic!), unless they are strongly influenced by Greek thought. The arguments already mentioned for suggesting that the *War* was written in Ptolemaic Egypt would of course fit in with this view. But when we come to consider the details of the military arrangements depicted the debt of the writer to Greek tactical treatises becomes even more apparent. Only a brief selection of these can be given here.

A conspicuous feature is the prominence given in the *War* to the characteristic Greek phalanx-formation. The infantry is to be drawn up seven rows in depth, each row being 1,000 men long.⁴ Four such formations ($7 \times 1000 \times 4$) makes up the grand total of 28,000 men in the infantry,⁵ and the division into lines and into fours is applied to the cavalry as well.⁶ These are the essential features of the Greek phalanx-formation, which in modified form (sixteen men deep, with the light-armed drawn up behind them in half this depth)⁷ was still the kernel of the Macedonian army in the field, but is known from Polybius to have become already outmoded in his time (the middle of the second century B.C.), being completely at the mercy of the more mobile Roman formations.⁸

The apocalyptic *War* thus depicts an *early* stage in the evolution of the phalanx, and in fact seems to be dependent (as later tactical writers are in general, to a remarkable degree) on

¹ Recalling Numbers, ii. 2 f. (cited above, p. 291).

² Gaster's translation, op. cit. p. 267.

³ Ibid. p. 264.

⁵ Gaster, p. 271.

⁷ Cf. Asclep. *Tact.* ii. 1, Polyb. xviii. 30.

⁴ *War*, § v. 3, Gaster, p. 267.

⁶ Ibid. p. 268 (§ vi. 7).

⁸ Polyb. xviii. 31 f.

accounts of the Spartan army in the fifth century B.C., which is recorded as having been normally drawn up in line eight men deep and a thousand men long.¹ In this Jewish work, the prescription of seven deep in place of eight is clearly due merely to the attachment to the mystical sevens which runs through the whole,² for an eight-deep phalanx is revealed as the underlying formation by the numbers assigned to the banners and the trumpets in another part of the *War*.³ But already by the early fourth century B.C. a much greater depth of phalanx was being adopted even by the Spartans themselves, as well as by their less conservative enemies.⁴

On the other hand, the armies put into the field by the Greek city states were never so large as the one described in the *War*, and the division of all the military forces into four complete phalanges⁵ must certainly be ascribed to the period after Alexander the Great. It duly appears in the *Tactica* of Asclepiodotus.⁶ The same treatise has a section on "Intervals" (§ iv), that is, on the methods of producing close or open formation between both files and ranks when in battle-formation, and another on various types of open formation between companies when on the march (§ xi. 7). In his article already referred to,⁷ J. G. Février has deduced from the references in the *War* to intervals or gaps in the line drawn up for battle⁸ a date of composition in the second century B.C., but this in itself is inadequate evidence; it merely serves as another illustration of the dependence of the author of the *War* on Greek tactical handbooks. To judge from the confusion in details which pervades this part of his work, the ancient author was incapable of distinguishing between what was of his own period and what had long been outmoded and given up.

¹ Cf. Veget. II. 2 (phalanx of 8,000) and for the normal Spartan depth, Thuc. v. 68.3.

² Cf. *War* § vi.1, viii. 2, Gaster, p. 267, foot, p. 270 (hurling of missiles seven times); § vii. 8 f., Gaster, pp. 269 f. (seven priests, seven Levites, seven trumpets).

³ In § iv (Gaster, pp. 266 f., under "Order of the standards") eight groups of inscribed standards is given for three separate occasions.

⁴ Cf. Xen. *Hellen.*, vi. iv. 12.

⁵ *War*, § ix. 4; cf. vi. 11, with Gaster's note 33a.

⁶ Asclep. *Tact.* iii. 1; cf. xi. 6.

⁷ See Bibliography (n. 1, p. 272).

⁸ *War* § vii. 8, etc., and Gaster, p. 295, n. 38.

Other scholars have made much of the alleged similarities to Roman army organisation in some passages of the apocalyptic *War*, in particular, in the description of the various types of battle-front.¹ The curved line, concave or convex towards the enemy, has been connected with the Roman *forfex* and *cuneus*; the *migdol* "tower" which is to protect each end of such lines has been explained as the Roman *turris*, which is said to be an alternative name for the *testudo*.² But this interpretation fails to take account of the ancient source of this whole series of Roman terms, which is Cato's *de re militari*.³ Cato wrote this work about 175 B.C.,⁴ that is, at about the same time as that to which it is now proposed to date the apocalyptic *War*. His sources at that time would certainly be Greek treatises on the military art, and in fact, the same formations are duly described in the ancient Greek *Tactica* which have survived,⁵ and in later writers who follow them. We know from a reference in Vegetius (fourth century A.D.) to Cato's tactical treatise⁶ that he himself was one of these. The Greek *Tactica* one and all, at all periods, are concerned exclusively with the phalanx-system, and not at all with the Roman maniple-formation or later systems.

As to the *migdol*, it is apparent from the description of it in the *War* that it has nothing whatever to do with the Roman *testudo*. This last was a small compact body of legionaries, protecting themselves against missiles or rocks hurled from above with their own interlocked shields raised over their heads, the hinder and outer ranks crouching in order to produce a sloping surface from which the stones, etc., would harmlessly roll off; in fact, something very closely resembling the shell of a tortoise from

¹ *War* § ix (Gaster, p. 272).

² Cf. Gaster, p. 295, n. 41 (following in the interpretation of this section of the work the views of Yigael Yadin).

³ Cf. Lindsey's edition of the fragments of Cato (Teubner, 1913), p. 466, line 30.

⁴ Cf. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, s.v. Cato. The "encyclopaedia" which contained his *de re militari* was written for his eldest son, who died when praetor designate (aet. c. 39) in 152 B.C. (cf. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vol. i, p. 431).

⁵ Cf. Asclep. *Tact.* xi. 5, on the κοιλέμβολος and ἔμβολος.

⁶ Veget. II. 3. cf. also the preface to Vegetius' work, enumerating the chief ancient authorities whom he has followed, including Cato.

which it takes its name. But the author of the *War* describes for his *migdol* a triangle formed of three hundred shield-bearers, the point to the front, and each line formed by a hundred men one behind the other. We may strongly suspect a misunderstanding on his part, confusing *turris* and *cuneus*, or rather their equivalents in the Greek source upon which he was drawing. He evidently did not understand the nature either of the "tower" (whatever this was) or of the "wedge".

It may well be that there are other confusions and inaccuracies in the whole work as far as its military sections are concerned. It does not sound like a serious description of contemporary armies. But these points need to be worked out in greater detail; for the present I must confine myself to the observation that a date in the first half of the second century B.C., indicated for the *War* on other grounds, is not improbable so far as its military aspects are concerned. Both the style and the details of the military sections fit in with the indications that the *War* was written in Ptolemaic Egypt, where copies of the Greek tactical writers may be supposed to have been readily accessible.

SAMARITAN STUDIES

By THE REV. JOHN BOWMAN, M.A., B.D., D.Phil.

HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

I. THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SAMARITANS

THE Samaritans today number approximately 300 souls. They were once a large community. Josephus¹ describes their territory as one of the three divisions of Western Palestine. They had a senate² of their own which induced Rome to recall Pilate. They had a diaspora³ throughout most of the Roman Empire. They were a constant worry⁴ to the Jews with whom and with whose Mosaic religion they had so much in common. The Jewish attitude to them varied: they are Israel⁵ or they are not Israel. The earlier Rabbinic sources are the more tolerant.⁶

¹ B.J. III. iii. 4.

² Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iv. 2.

³ They had had a community in Egypt since the time of Alexander. Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XI. viii. 6. There was a Samaritan community in Rome c. A.D. 500. According to T. B. Gittin 45a Samaritans were in Babylon in the fourth century A.D. Cf. Montgomery, *The Samaritans* (The Samaritans in Diaspora), (Philadelphia, 1907), pp. 148-53.

⁴ In the time of Antiochus III they sold many Jews into slavery, Josephus, *Antiq.* XII. iv. 1. They deliberately misled Jews as to the appearance of the New Moon; important as it was for calculating Jewish Festivals, M. Rosh HaSh II. 2.

On one occasion they tried to desecrate the Jerusalem Temple on the eve of Passover, Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. ii. 2. On another occasion attacked Jewish pilgrims on the way to Jerusalem, Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. vi. 1.

⁵ In M. Demai iii. 4 Samaritans are regarded as like the Jewish Am-Haaretz, and not Gentile. In M. Demai v. 9 a distinction is made between an Israelite (a Rabbinic Jew (cf. M. Tohoroth iv. 1)) and a Samaritan; but a distinction is also made between a Samaritan and a Gentile. The attitude to the Samaritans was not constant, e.g. T. B. Ber. 47b cites one opinion that the Samaritans did observe the written Law, and in what they observed were more strict than Jews. On the other hand M. Shebiith viii. 10 gives an opinion that he who eats the bread of the Samaritans is like one who eats swine's flesh. Yet the Talmudic Tractate Kuthim declares that Samaritans will be as Jews when they give up their faith in Mount Gerizim and acknowledge Jerusalem and the Resurrection of the Dead.

⁶ One finds the same conspiracy of silence in action against the Sadducees; e.g. cf. how after A.D. 70 the Rabbinic Beth Din was given the title Sanhedrin and the Rabbis' ideas of what its powers should always have been were projected back into the past.

There was, of course, Biblical authority 2 Kings xvii. 24 f.¹ that the Samaritans were non-Israelite incomers and that their religion was a mixture of Yahwism and their former idolatry.² The old libel sticks.

The differing attitude of the Four Gospels to the Samaritans is typical of Judaism. In the Gospel of St. John considerable prominence is given to the Samaritans. Matthew (Matt. x. 5) merely mentions that Jesus commanded the twelve disciples not to enter the cities of the Samaritans. Mark does not mention them at all. Luke (Luke ix. 52 f.) mentions the churlish refusal of the Samaritan village to give Jesus hospitality, but also recounts (Luke x. 33-7) the parable of the Good Samaritan, and states too (Luke xvii. 11-18) that the only leper who returned of the ten healed, was a Samaritan. Luke's attitude to the Samaritans is friendly,³ Matthew's attitude hostile, while Mark's attitude is non-existent.⁴ John's attitude to the Samaritans is different. In the story of the woman at Jacob's well (John iv. 4), the writer makes it quite plain that salvation is of the Jews (verse 22). Yet Jesus admits to the Samaritan woman of his being the Messiah (verse 26). The Jewish term Messiah is used in the Johannine account, but the Samaritan woman was not looking for a Jewish Davidic Messiah.⁵ Several times in John's Gospel, Jesus is

¹ Even if the 2 Kings xvii account were to be taken to mean that *all* Northern Israelites were deported, this is not borne out by other Biblical references to the remnant of Israel in the north after 721 B.C., cf. even 2 Chron. xxx. 6 where Hezekiah sends messengers to Northern Israel: "O people of Israel, return to the Lord, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, that he may turn again to the remnant of you who have escaped from the hand of the kings of Assyria." Chronicles was the first Jewish apologetic against the Samaritans, but does admit here that the northern people were a remnant of Israel.

² Cf. 2 Kings xvii. 33, 34. Even if it once had been true, by New Testament times they had had over 700 years to learn better.

³ Even so, cf. Luke xvii. 18 where the Samaritan is described as "this stranger".

⁴ The fact that Mark does not mention Samaritans may be due to deliberate disregard.

⁵ In John iv. 19 the Samaritan woman is made to say that she perceives that Jesus is "a prophet". For the Samaritans there was, and could be, no prophet after Moses, with one exception, their Messiah or Taheb, the prophet like Moses promised in Deut. xviii. 18. There is the very distinct possibility that the Samaritans understood the Taheb to be Moses returning to earth again. In John's Gospel whereas occasional reference is made to the prophets having

declared to be the prophet which was to come—the expectation based on Deut. xviii. 18. The use of this verse as applied to the Messiah is not attested in Rabbinic writings; ¹ it was the basic text for the Samaritan Messiah or Taheb. In fact, in John vii. 40-3 a division arose among the people as to whether Jesus was that prophet of Deut. xviii. 18 or the Davidic Messiah. Who suggested on that occasion that he was that prophet, the prophet like Moses? Were there Samaritans among the crowd? Gentiles are mentioned but once in John's Gospel and not by Jesus but by the Jews.² The Greeks who came to him (John xii. 30) were obviously Greek Jews up at Jerusalem for the Festival.

In the prologue John the Baptist testifies of Him (John i. 15-17). Andrew in telling Peter testifies (John i. 41) of Him. Nathaniel testifies of Him (John i. 49). The next testimony is that of the Samaritans that He is the Christ, the Saviour of the World (John iv. 42). The Samaritans are further thrown into prominence by John in that the Jews say that Jesus is a Samaritan

testified of Jesus, more often it is Moses who is called as witness. And those who recognize Him see Him as that Prophet that is to come (cf. John i. 21; vi. 14; vii. 40) a prediction based on Deut. xviii. 18 the Samaritan Messianic proof text. Deut. xviii. 18 along with Deut. xxvii. 1-7 (reading Gerizim for Ebal (verse 4)) forms part of the extra Samaritan Tenth Commandment in all the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch MSS. This Samaritan Tenth Commandment is old. It stresses that God is to be worshipped on Mt. Gerizim, and then stresses the hope of the coming of the Taheb, the prophet like unto Moses. It is significant that in John iv. after the discussion on where and how to worship God, the Samaritan woman asks if Jesus is the Taheb. The two subjects are both dealt with in the Samaritan Tenth Commandment.

¹ It is possible that it was so used earlier. One is always faced with the difficulty in using Rabbinic sources to know whether the Mishnah and Talmud really represent first century Judaism, or a deliberately edited "Normative Judaism" of later times when the Rabbis had become dominant. In any case Rabbinic Judaism did not stress belief. Haggadic statements only show how any one individual interpreted such and such a verse, or what opinion he suggested could be held. Samaritanism has a creed, a simple creed, which is recited privately before every service and publicly at the beginning of every service. This creed is very old; but Judaism had nothing like a credal statement till the time of Maimonides. Even thereafter emphasis was on orthopraxis, not orthodoxy. See further "Faith in Samaritan Thought" (pp. 308 sqq. below).

² When Jesus said (John vii. 34) that He would go, they would not be able to find Him, the Jews (verse 35) are represented as asking themselves whether he would go to "the dispersed among the Gentiles and teach the Gentiles". In John's Gospel the only non-Jewish community Jesus meets are the Samaritans.

and has a devil. In three other cases (John vii. 20 ; viii. 52 ; x. 20) they say He has a devil. When the Jews say He is a Samaritan and has a devil, Jesus denies the charge of having a devil, and ignores the allegation of being a Samaritan. Obviously He was not a Samaritan.¹

In the great speech on the shepherd of the sheep (John x), Jesus says He has other sheep not of this fold (the Jewish fold) (John x. 16). There will be one shepherd and one flock. He is obviously thinking of Ezek. xxxiv. 22-4, God will judge between His sheep and David His servant will be their shepherd. In Ezek. xxxvii. 15 ff. the prophet is told to take a stick and mark it for Judah and another and mark it for Ephraim, and make them into one stick, the symbol of the re-united Israel and Judah. Later in that chapter we have again the claim that one shepherd will be over them ; David of Judah is to be that shepherd (Ezek. xxxvii. 24). Whatever date we assign to Ezekiel the inhabitants of Northern Israel in his days were Samaritans. It is possible that Jesus when He talks of " the other sheep not of your fold ", is thinking of the Samaritans, the only non-Jewish group in this Gospel who had been approached and who had accepted Him.

In dealing with the Samaritan woman's claims, Jesus showed that salvation was of the Jews, but that He, Jesus, was the fulfilment of the Samaritan Messianic hope. He saw a rich harvest ready in Samaria. The fields are white in harvest² (John iv. 35 ff.). They would reap there what they as Jews have not sown. It is perhaps not without significance that the Samaritan woman is placed soon after the story of Nicodemus (John iii) ; whereas the Jew failed to understand Jesus' teaching of the need for spiritual rebirth, the Samaritan woman seemed impressed by Jesus' teaching about a day when men would worship God neither at Gerizim nor Jerusalem only, but anywhere

¹ It is interesting that in Matthew's reference to the Samaritans, the Disciples are told to concentrate on the lost sheep of Israel ; but there Israel means merely Judah.

² Professor C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (C.U.P. 1954), p. 316, is indeed right in stressing the ultimacy, the finality of the appearance and work of Christ as denoted by Jesus' answer that the fields are already white for reaping ; but the saying may also reflect the preparedness of the Samaritans to receive the Gospel.

in spirit and truth. Just as Jesus' teaching on the one flock one shepherd, was drawn from Ezekiel, a section of Ezekiel closely associated with the re-unification of Northern Israel and Judah, so John iii. 5 on the need for man to be born of water and of the spirit seems to echo Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, the sprinkling with clean water, and the giving of a new heart and new spirit. Jesus' use of the ideas of Ezekiel far transcends their original content, yet it may be significant that both are drawn from this section in which Ezekiel looks forward to the unification of divided Israel.

Is it possible that the Gospel writer while not giving up the Jewish claim that salvation is of the Jews, is showing that Jesus is the fulfilment of all Israel's hope, the hope of Judah and also of the Samaritans who claimed to be the descendants of Northern Israel? If that were so, one might expect to find in the Gospel of John elements which would appear to Jews as Samaritan, and the fact that this was so might lead them to dub Jesus a Samaritan. And when this was done, the writer of the Gospel would deliberately not refute such a charge, hoping thereby to show that there was an element in his version of Jesus' teaching consonant with Samaritan belief. In short, is it not possible that the author of John is trying to make a bridge between Samaritans and Jews in Christ?

But in what way could Jesus' teaching be like the Samaritan? First it is essential to give in brief some Samaritan Theology. There is a Samaritan Theology.¹ Emphasis in Samaritanism is on belief, not on the doing of religious practices as with the Jews.

God created by Ten Words.² With the first Word, "Let

¹ There is little Samaritan Halakah, as they never evolved an Oral Law like the Rabbis, but try to keep the Written Law *au pied de la lettre*. Instead of developing a blueprint to cover all life's actions, actual or putative, like the Jewish Halakah, they concentrated on Theology. The Samaritans are very conservative, and their Theology is very rudimentary. It is possible that Judaism itself once stressed belief as much as the fulfilling of ritual acts, but with the creation of Normative Judaism put the emphasis on the fulfilling of religious requirements. Yet there are various Jewish haggadoth which may once have been constituent parts of some early Jewish Theology. For further development of these points see "Faith in Samaritan Thought", (pp. 308 sqq. below).

² The subsequent statement of Samaritan teaching about Creation, Fall of Man and Original Sin is taken from the Malef which contains the teaching on Bible and Theology taught by Samaritans to Samaritan children. The work may not be old

there be light ", God created : " the light, from which was the Holy Spirit which He caused to rest in the loins of the prophets and which He manifested in the image of our Lord Moses in the unseen world and the seen." This light—the Holy Spirit—is regarded as the pre-existent Moses. Creation was for the sake of Moses, who is the highest of all creatures seen or unseen, the source of all light. Adam was created on the sixth day : the angel of the Lord formed him of dust from the earth ; God breathed the breath of life into him. Adam was like us, but at the same time different from us as we are now. Adam was like the angels. Adam had no evil impulse. Adam and Eve did not have sexual intercourse¹ in Eden. Eden was holy, and sexual intercourse was impure. Adam and Eve in the Garden were clothed in light. The wicked spirit Belial entered the serpent and enticed Eve. Adam listened to Eve because of the evil

but it is unlikely to contain any innovation, especially as it was used for the teaching of children. In any case its statements can be paralleled by those of the Liturgy, especially is this the case in its teaching about the pre-existent Moses.

¹ This is explicitly stated in the Malef. However, the Malef J. R. (G) 1169, fol. 69b on the ten words of creation says of the ninth. His saying : Be fruitful and multiply (Gen. i. 28) and by this word did the mystery of God take place in man, in the loins of the male was the origin of the seed ; and in the belly of the female that very seed is fixed until when it is completed, it returns to the earth. And the human race is (thereby) increased. This section of the ten words of creation precedes the ten commandments ; it is brief and takes no account of the Fall story. While there is systematization of belief to some extent in Samaritanism, it would be wrong to look for a fully integrated Theology. Samaritanism probably found it difficult to reconcile Gen. i, ii. In fact it did not try to do so. This section summarizes the ten words of creation and gives them concisely and with little haggadic development.

The Malef, fol. 70a in its section on the ten words of creation while giving them concisely and without haggadic development in general does however stress the primacy of the light of Moses, e.g. " The First (Word) ' And God said, let there be light '. Now the creation of the angels was thus, and the coming into existence of the light from which all the luminaries and the Image and the Spirit were derived. But the origin of the whole was the light of Moses." Cf. also the hymn for the Sabbath of Mo'ed Hag ha-Matzoth, Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy*, (O.U.P., 1909), i. 228-9 What is important is not that here the command to multiply is recognized as Divine, but that there should be a carefully formulated Samaritan story of pre-fallen Man which regarded intercourse in Eden as impossible because unclean. Perhaps the apparent contradiction was not unnoticed by the Samaritan compiler, but he gave the story associating intercourse with fallen man because it was an old tradition which could not be ignored.

impulse he received from her, who in turn had received it from Belial. Adam ate the forbidden fruit. Adam would have died at once, had it not been for the fact that the image¹ of Moses, which was the light of the First Day, was concealed in Adam. "Behold", said God, "Adam has become like one *from him*." (Not as Jews and Christians interpret it, "Like one of us".) The Samaritans say that Moses was the one *from him*,² to know good and evil. Adam on leaving the Garden had his garment of light stripped off and so had Eve; they were given tunics of skin, i.e. fleshly bodies so the Samaritans understand this, and in the skin was the evil impulse. The Samaritans read in the curse put on Adam "thy dust"³ instead of dust. "Dust thou art, and to thy dust shalt thou return." They maintain that this teaches the return of the spirit to the flesh, to its own body's flesh at the resurrection for both spirit and body to be judged. Thereafter the spirit receives a new body of light, and clad in light, not flesh, enters Paradise. Adam on leaving Eden knew Eve eight days thereafter. As a result Cain and his twin sister were born. Then Abel and his twin sister. Those descended from Cain are the sons of Belial.⁴ They are not in the image of God.

¹ Cf. Montgomery (op. cit. p. 228) who knew of a similar concept of the drop of light which passed from Adam through the forbears of Moses until it was fully incarnated in the prophet. Montgomery's remark that this is merely "a replica of the Islamic legend of 'the Light of Mohammed'" proves nothing as to which is the earlier the Samaritan or the Mohammedan legend.

² Gen. iii. 22. This interpretation "from him" may well be old and have had a share in building up the pre-existent Moses legend.

³ Gen. iii. 19. The reading "thy dust" is attested in the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch MSS. This would point to an early proof text for the resurrection being devised by the Samaritans, and before their Bible text was fixed.

⁴ The sons of Belial. The children of Belial are mentioned in Deut. xiii. 13. In the Malef Belial is the name given to the angel-like spirit who enters into the serpent and entices Eve. The reason given by the Malef why Cain's sons are called sons of Belial is that Cain's sister and wife was called Alalah. They were children by Alalah. This is not very convincing. It is possible that the Samaritans had a similar legend to that in Pirke de R. Eliezer (cf. Friedlander's translation, Kegan Paul, 1916, p. 150 and p. 158 f.). It is clear in the Pirke de R. Eliezer that Cain was the result of an illicit union between Sammael and Eve. Pirke de R. Eliezer dwells on the fact that in Gen. v. 3 Seth is said to be in Adam's own likeness after his image; such is said of neither Cain nor Abel. The Samaritans do not deny Adam's paternity of Cain and Abel; but despite the unconvincing etymology of the name sons of Belial, it is not without significance

They are fallen man *par excellence*. Only after Cain had murdered Abel, did Adam repent to God of his own sin. For 100 years, during which period he kept a vow of sexual abstinence, did he repent. After God forgave him, Adam knew Eve again, and Seth and other children were born. God who accepted Adam's repentance, established from him the pure line from which arose the prophet Moses. Apart from the pure line which the Samaritans as the true Israel possess, all mankind is fallen.

The Samaritans compare the two Cherubim¹ over the ark of the Law with the two Cherubim stationed at the gate of Eden to guard the way to the Tree of Life. The Law is the tree of life, eternal life; all who eat of its fruit are potentially inhabitants of Paradise now. The Law is the one way to eternal life. Adam after having sinned had to have the sentence of death passed on him and his descendants. This was the only way in which he could lose the body of the flesh with its evil inclination,² and regain the body of light which was his before he sinned. After the resurrection he becomes a spiritual being clad in light as he originally was. Note that man could not share in eternal life until Moses the Light of the World³ came with the Law; but even then and now too, eternal life is only for the true Israel as the Samaritans regard themselves.

Turning now to John we note the emphasis on the Word, but must admit that there is no developed Logos doctrine in Samaritan that Cain's progeny are called after the name of the tempting spirit Belial of the Samaritan Temptation story. The New Testament John viii. 44 obviously knew of a similar story of the paternity of Cain.

¹ For Cherubim over the ark of the Law, Exod. xxv. 18 ff. For Cherubim at the east of the Garden of Eden, Gen. iii. 24.

² Yetzer ha-Ra.

³ Montgomery also knows of their title, cf. *ibid.* p. 226, but is perhaps rash in alleging it has been derived from Christianity. Montgomery did not see it as part of a comprehensive Samaritan Midrash on Moses. There is a Birth Story of Moses read on the anniversary of his birth, and also during Tabernacles, which gives the complete Moses doctrine. The story is read at a special service.

Marqah in his *Memar* in the fourth century A.D. witnesses to the central place Moses held in Samaritanism. Unfortunately the whole *Memar* is not existent; the birth story of Moses is missing. (The missing part of Marqah seems to be referred to in the Molad Mosheh J. R. (G.) 865 read on the anniversary of Moses' birth.) But even so, Marqah can say of Moses that it was on his account that the world was made. Moses is for Marqah the Pure One, the Light on earth. Cf. Montgomery, *ibid.* p. 226.

Theology. In Samaritan Theology light is important : so too in John ; one thinks of John i. 4, In Him was life : and the life was the light of men. John (cf. John i. 8) was not the light, but came that he might bear witness of that light : (John i. 9) which was the true light even the light which lighteth every man coming into the world. (John i. 10) He was in the world, and the world was made by Him and the world knew Him not. (John i. 12) But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the children of God. Very important are Jesus' references to Himself as the light of the world. (Cf. John viii. 12, ix. 5.) Those that believe in Him can become children of light.

To contrast Samaritan ideas with the Johannine: The Johannine pre-existent Christ is active in creation. It is not clear that the light of the First Day, equated in Samaritanism with the Holy Spirit who is Moses, is active in creation. But it is stated that the light of Moses was the origin of the light of the stars and of the spirit of prophecy, i.e. it was used in creation, and was working in men before the coming of Moses in the flesh. In John (John i. 9), the light, the true light lighteth every man which cometh into the world. In Samaritanism this light was in Adam and was transmitted from him through the prophets, i.e. the patriarchs, to Moses. It is not in every man, at the most it was in some Israelites before the coming of Moses. Even after Moses revealed the Law it was made available for Israelites, but not for Gentiles. The Samaritan light which God called into being by His word on the First day of creation was the Holy Spirit and the pre-existent Moses.¹ In John the Holy Spirit is the spirit of Jesus, and Jesus is the light. We have here the identification of Holy Spirit and the Light as in Samaritanism.

As to John viii. 48 there is sufficient in the Johannine picture of Jesus which would suggest to Jews that Jesus was not as the Scribes and Pharisees if we can judge these by the later Rabbinic writings. His emphasis on faith, on belief instead of the fulfilment of ritual religious acts would seem strange. If there is any historical foundation for the speeches in John viii, it is not surprising that the Jews regarded him as a Samaritan. It seems

¹ This may (if we understand Jesus for Moses) be equated with John i. 10, "He (the true light) was in the world, and the world knew Him not".

quite beside the point to interpret John viii. 19 the Jews' question as to "where is your Father?" as an allegation of illegitimacy founded on the Virgin Birth.¹ In any case, the Jews (John vi. 42) had said "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" It is even more tendentious to read into the allegation that Jesus is a Samaritan that this is a reference back to this allegation of illegitimacy, because Samaritans were supposed on the basis of 2 Kings xvii to be illegitimate Jews. In John viii. 33 the Jews declare themselves to be freeborn descendants of Abraham and do not need to be set free. They fail to understand that they are slaves to sin. In verse 39 when they reiterate that Abraham is their father, Jesus points out that their conduct in seeking to kill Him is not the conduct of Abraham, but of Cain. "You do what your father did." Their retort: "We were not born of fornication" is not a reference to any libel on the Virgin Birth. That should be clear enough from the second part of the sentence: "We have one Father even God." According to the Fall story in Pirke de R. Eliezer (ch. xxxi, ed. Friedlander, pp. 150 f.) Sammael using the Serpent as intermediary seduced Eve, and Cain and Abel were born of this fornication. Pirke de R. Eliezer points out that only with Seth was it said that Adam begat in his own likeness, after his image. This had not been said of Cain and Abel. The Samaritan Fall story does not mention the seduction of Eve by Belial, but the sons of Cain are called the sons of Belial. Jesus in John viii. 44 says that his Jewish opponents were of their father the Devil, and it is because they are of his nature that they cannot accept the truth which Jesus tells. Now this was an amazing statement by a Jew about Jewish teachers. Those to whom it was addressed would not have regarded it possible for a Jew to have said that of other Jews. If Jews raked up the old story of 2 Kings xvii. 24 f. about the Cuthean and other settlers of devastated Ephraim, and the Samaritans being the resulting mixed race, their opponents went further and alleged that Jews were no better than Gentiles. The progeny of Cain were the peoples of the land, and these people did marry some of the progeny of Seth. To call Jews, sons of the Devil would be quite in character for a Samaritan;

¹ Cf. *The Fourth Gospel*, Hoskyns and Davey (Faber & Faber, 1940), ii. 392 ff.

for Jews to call Jesus a Samaritan should not be taken literally,¹ it was as if He were acting the Samaritan in expressing such opinions. Even if John's Gospel was written in Ephesus, it is quite wrong to think of the Samaritan Jewish dispute as a local affair.² Samaritans were throughout the Empire. All that space allows in this communication is to point out the possibility that this Gospel sets out the teaching of Jesus in a way that would make it more attractive to the Samaritans; but it does not stop at that; it professes that even Jews regarded it as such. The point of contact between John's Gospel and Samaritan Theology seems to be the ascribing to the pre-existent Christ what Samaritan Theology ascribes to the pre-existent Moses. Further there is the making available for men *now* the possibility of becoming sons of light, of ridding themselves of the burden of the sinful flesh now, which for the Samaritan can only be done in Samaritanism at the end on Resurrection Day, Moses acting there as intercessor only for Samaritans. The Law gave to the Samaritan Eternal Life. To the Christian this comes by belief in Christ. True, for Samaritans Moses intercedes now and at the end. Christ does this for the Christian irrespective of whether he is Samaritan or Jew. And what John saw Christ doing in his generation has been made available by His Spirit, the Spirit of God for the world outside all Israel (both Samaritan and Jewish).

II. FAITH IN SAMARITAN THOUGHT

THE Samaritan Bible is the Pentateuch. The Samaritan interprets the Biblical text literally. There is practically no halakic development as in Rabbinic Judaism based either on

¹ Montgomery (*The Samaritans*, pp. 154-5) asserts that in John viii. 48 the term "Samaritan" means "fool". He believes that this must be the case since Ecclesiasticus speaks of "the foolish race that sojourn in Shechem", and the writer of the Testament of Levi states: "From this day will Shechem be called the city of Fools". One does not find this convincing. Had the term "Samaritan" been a recognized synonym for fool, one would have expected to find examples of the term itself so used.

² From Josephus, *Antiq* xiii. iii. 4, we know how in Egypt they argued with the Jews before Ptolemy as to whether Mt. Gerizim or Mt. Zion was the place chosen by God for this worship.

tradition or artificial Exegesis. Samaritanism in practice is both severer and more lenient than Judaism; severer in that the legal demands of the Torah must be literally obeyed without any modification such as was beloved of the Rabbis; more lenient in that the commandments are not extended in scope either as a fence about the Law or to cover all life as the Rabbis attempted to do. Samaritanism did not present a blueprint for every action in life, but a blueprint for belief. It has always been wrong to speak of Orthodox Judaism at any time in the history of Rabbinic Judaism. Orthodoxy there never was nor is there any; orthopraxis there once was, and is, though today the observance of full orthopraxis is hard indeed. The Rabbinic Judaism which made itself normative from the second century A.D. on, and which is set out in Mishnah and the Talmuds, stresses not only the practice of all that is laid down in the 613 laws of the Torah, but also of the vast mass of additional laws and prohibitions which the Rabbis developed. Rabbinic Judaism offered salvation by works, not by faith. In vain might Maimonides in the Middle Ages draw up thirteen principles which a man must believe, or, he declared, such a one was not a Jew. Samaritanism stressed works—the fulfilment of the 613 laws of the Torah; but faith was equally stressed. There exists for the instruction of children a Samaritan manual¹ which they must learn that they may be sound on the doctrines of their religion and the facts of their history. There is no reason to see this as a late innovation. The doctrines therein set out can be found in their ancient liturgy.

Samaritanism has a Theology, in a sense that Judaism has no Theology; Samaritanism has a Creed in a sense that Judaism very definitely has not. The Samaritan Creed is old. It appears for example in page 3 of the Samaritan Liturgy,² vol. 1, in the opening prayer of the Eve of Sabbath service. "I am that I am, My Lord, we worship none but Thee nor have we (any other) faith but in Thee and in Moses Thy prophet and in Thy scriptures of Truth and in the place of Thy worship, Mount Gerizim, House of God, the Mount of rest, inheritance and the

¹ The Malef Gaster MS. 1169 in the John Rylands Library cf. p. 303 n. 1 above.

² Edited by A. E. Cowley, Oxford Univ. Press, 1909.

divine presence, and in the Day of Vengeance and Retribution."

But before every service the Samaritan priest in his alb purifies himself by washing the hands, mouth, nose, face, and right and left foot, reciting while doing so versicles of Scripture. While washing the face he says the Creed, proclaiming and saying, "there is no God but One. Yahweh is our God, Yahweh is One. There is no God but One. My faith is in Thee, Yahweh, and in Moses the son of Amram, Thy servant, and in the holy Torah, and in Mount Gerizim, House of God, the chosen and hallowed (place), the choicest of the earth. There is no God but One." The Creed here has but four points of belief; the fifth, mentioned in the introductory prayer for the Eve of Sabbath service, belief in the Day of Vengeance and Retribution, is omitted. That the Day of Vengeance is omitted in one form of the Creed does not imply that this is a later addition. The Samaritan belief in the Day of Vengeance based on their reading of Deut. xxxii. 35 is old; ¹ already the LXX knew of it. In some forms of the Samaritan creed the Taheb or Samaritan Messiah is also mentioned in connection with the Day of Vengeance and Retribution. In the Samaritan Tenth Commandment, which declares Mount Gerizim is the place where God is to be worshipped, an appendix follows telling of the coming of the one like Moses, ² the Taheb. ³ The belief is old; in fact it is significant that in John iv the Samaritan woman having stressed (verse 20) the claims of "that Mountain" (i.e. Mount Gerizim) at Shechem as against Zion, and having been enlightened by Jesus as to the manner of true worship, asks (verse 25) if he is the Messiah, or as she as a Samaritan would say, Taheb. One could argue from the mention of the Taheb/Messiah after "that mountain" that the writer ⁴ of the Fourth Gospel knew

¹ Cf. "Early Samaritan Eschatology" by John Bowman in *The Journal of Jewish Studies*, vi, no. 2, 63-72, September 1955.

² Cf. *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*, Von Gall, Giessen, 1918, p. 159, where Deut. xviii. 18 *inter alia* is inserted after Exod. xx. 21.

³ The Taheb is the Samaritan name for the Messiah. The Taheb has nothing to do with any Davidic Messiah, but is the one like Moses. As to the identity of the Taheb, cf. the article mentioned under note 2, p. 67 *ibid*.

⁴ Dr. Jeremias of Göttingen, with whom I discussed this matter at the Society for New Testament Studies at Bangor in September 1955, would agree to this suggestion.

the Samaritan Tenth Commandment in the form in which it appears in the Samaritan Bible.

The prayer in which the Samaritan creed appears is one of the earliest prayers of the Samaritans, probably dating from the service of their Temple which was destroyed by John Hyrcanus in the second century B.C. This prayer belongs to a small number of Samaritan Liturgical pieces which Cowley, the great Samaritan expert, was prepared to recognize as representing the earliest level of the Samaritan Liturgy. In that form of the Samaritan Creed there is mention of belief in God, belief in Moses, in the Scriptures, and in Mount Gerizim and in the Day of Vengeance. It may be that the Taheb doctrine was still outside orthodoxy.¹ Interesting, however, is the fact that there are five points of belief just as there are five fingers to the hand. This may be significant. (The Samaritans do not lay Tefillin as do the Jews, but take Deut. vi. 8 (thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hands) as referring to the Ten Commandments² of Deut. v. 6-21). Above we have sought to demonstrate that the Samaritans have an Article of Faith. But what of their attitude to belief? Each of the five tenets of the Article of Faith is a statement of faith, an intellectual statement of faith, but more than that. There is faith³ in each of the points of belief.

¹ For the growth of the Taheb doctrine, cf. the above mentioned article. At the earliest stage there was no agent but God Himself who would effect deliverance on the Day of the Lord. This was not associated with the End of the World. Later the Taheb, returning one, or restorer, appears as God's agent. With the growth of the belief in Immortality among the Samaritans, there was a tendency among Samaritan sects that denied the resurrection, still to regard the Taheb as merely ushering in a new period of worldly prosperity for the Samaritans in this world. As a result the orthodox Samaritan Theologian Marqah of the fourth century A.D. plays down the Taheb doctrine; in so far as he allows it at all he transfers the Taheb's activities to the end of time.

² Philo, *De Decem Oraculis XII*, divided the Ten Commandments into two groups of five. The Samaritan reading in Deut. vi. 8 is יִדִּיךְ not דָּךְ associating the Ten Commandments, in two groups of five with the five fingers of one's two hands.

³ While Samaritan Hebrew vocabulary is Pentateuchal and therefore retains the primitive conception of the אֱמֶן, its derivatives for the Samaritan tend to have the intellectual element which Professor C. H. Dodd (*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1954, p. 180) rightly regards as "more prominent in the Greek, while the moral element is more prominent, as it is fundamental, in the Hebrew".

Obviously they give precedence to faith in God in his Unity. Samaritan Liturgy echoes the pathetic faith and trust in God. They use, however, another verb יָרַח of trust in God. The root אָמַן with them implies belief in God,¹ not just simple trust but intellectual assent. Their faith in Moses is closely associated with faith in God just as the name of Moses is ever closely associated with that of God throughout their liturgy. There is almost a Samaritan Christology in the name of Moses.²

In John's Gospel, iv. 39, 41, 42, the Samaritans believe in Christ. If by the first century the Samaritans' belief in the Taheb was already incorporated in the fifth article of their creed, and if they saw in Jesus their Messiah or Taheb, we might use the Johannine statement as a guide to the nature of the meaning of faith in Samaritan thought. Faith and knowledge have much in common in John. The Samaritan woman knew³ that Messiah/Taheb cometh, John iv. 25. It was the fifth article of their creed. When she told the Samaritans of Him, they first believed in Him⁴ because of what she said, cf. John iv. 39; but after coming to Him and hearing Him they believed not just because of what she said, but because they had heard Him for themselves and as a result recognized and acknowledged "that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the World". The intellectual basis of their belief is surely strongly marked. The woman at the well had stated the general fact of her belief, "I know that Messiah cometh". Now the Samaritans know for themselves that Jesus is He, verse 42; their belief has been fulfilled, and they are convinced that it is so. As in the woman's question to Jesus at the well, John iv. 25, it is unlikely

¹ I.e. credence in.

² Not only in that Moses and the Taheb seem one and the same, but Creation was for the sake of Moses, who is identified with the Holy Spirit. While Samaritanism is strictly monotheistic, the name of Moses is often associated by them with that of God. Moses prays for Samaritans now and at the End on the Day of Vengeance and Recompense.

³ The verb used is not, however, γινώσκειν .

⁴ John iv. 39. Many of the Samaritans $\text{ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν}$; this may stress "the moral element of personal trust or reliance inherent in the Hebrew and Aramaic phrase", as Professor Dodd writes of this construction (ibid. p. 183); but John iv. 42 shows the intellectual basis of their belief. We should, however, not over-emphasize the intellectual, as יָדַע carries the meaning of knowing by means of the whole personality and not merely by the intellect.

that the Samaritans here in John iv. 42 used the word Christ, but rather Taheb. For the Samaritan the Taheb was the one like Moses, or Moses *redivivus*. It is significant that the Samaritans when they acknowledge Christ hail him as the Saviour of the World, John iv. 42, the title which they give to Moses in their liturgy. Elsewhere¹ I have sought to demonstrate that the Fourth Gospel seeks to state the Christian message in a form acceptable to the Samaritans while not jettisoning the fact that salvation is of the Jews, John iv. 22. In the Fourth Gospel no claim is made for the Davidic Messiahship² of Jesus; He is the prophet that was to come; the one like Moses.³

I have suggested above that the Samaritan connotation of faith can be understood as not unlike that given to faith in the Fourth Gospel, where *πίστις* and *γνῶσις* have much in common. Can the Samaritan creed be found hinted at in the Fourth Gospel? In chapter iv the fourth and fifth points Gerizim and the Taheb are mentioned. Jesus condemns them for worshipping they know not what (verse 22). This has nothing to do with false Gods,⁴ but presumably the hidebound formalism of Samaritanism is condemned which existed along with their stress on faith. Still they had faith and recognized Christ. The fields were white already to harvest, verse 35, though Jews had not sown the seed there (cf. verse 38).

In chapter v of John, Jesus, when speaking with Jews in Jerusalem, condemns them for not having the love of God in them, verse 42, not believing in Moses, verse 46, nor in his writings, verse 47; cf. also verses 37, 38, where the Jews, it is stated, have not heard God's voice, nor have His word in them;

¹ See I above, pp. 298. sqq.

² Despite John vii. 41, 42. In any case not only do we twice in John's Gospel find Jesus acclaimed by people as the prophet of Deut. xviii. 18 (cf. John vi. 14 and John vii. 40) but Jesus Himself in John iii. 34 and John xii. 49 applies to Himself the proofs of the true prophet mentioned as such in Deut. xviii. 18, 19.

³ The use of Deut. xviii. 18 as applied to the Messiah is not attested in Rabbinic writing.

⁴ Even if the 2 Kings xvii. 33, 34 account had once been true, by New Testament times they had had over 700 years to learn better. Rabbinic Judaism speaks with several voices about the Samaritans but T. B. Ber. 47b cites the opinion that the Samaritans did observe the Written Law, and in what they observed were more strict than Jews.

had they believed in Moses they would have believed in Him of whom Moses testified. One is reminded of points 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the Samaritan Creed, Belief in God, Belief in Moses,¹ Belief in the Law, and Belief in the Taheb.

Belief in Mount Gerizim or in Jerusalem is naturally not inserted.² Such had been condemned in connection with the Samaritans in chapter iv. 21 ff. If we had here the basis of a creed in chapter v. 45-7 it, with the corresponding points in the Samaritan creed, might point to a common creed for Jew and Samaritan. Undoubtedly whether there was a formal creed or not, Belief in God, in Moses, in the Law, was basic to both Jew and Samaritan; the Samaritan, however, added as article 4 that Mount Gerizim is where to worship God, the Jews, Jerusalem. Denial of belief in the divine origin of the Torah, Jews held, excluded a man from the world to come, M. Šəḥ XI¹. In John chapter iv. the Samaritans seem, while criticized, to appear more to advantage than the Jews in chapter v. 36-47. Samaritanism was a form of Judaism but of pre-Rabbinic Judaism. Samaritanism stressed faith, sometimes faith in the wrong things, e.g. Mount Gerizim, but faith as well as works was important. Rabbinic Judaism shifted the emphasis from faith to works. The shift in emphasis was only taking place in the first century. It is possible that Faith, as opposed to works in Paul and James respectively, reflects in the early Christian Church what was becoming a burning issue in Judaism. Samaritanism may help us to rediscover a picture of a pre-Rabbinic creed gathering up in five points those things in which one must have faith. *A priori* it is unlikely that Judaism before the blueprint for practice had been developed (and it was not finalized for several centuries) had found it unnecessary to provide its devotees during the Hellenistic epoch with a guide to right belief. M. Šanh. XI¹ excludes from the world to come those that deny belief in the resurrection or in the divine origin of the Torah. Earlier M. Ab. 1¹¹ Abtalion warns against heresy and

¹ Even in Judaism (though there were other prophets and not one prophet Moses), also as in Samaritanism, Moses' position is unique among the sons of Adam. In the same way for Jews the position of the Law is unique among the rest of the books of the Bible.

² Nor was it to be expected.

unbelief. With the reaction in Judaism against belief because of Christianity's stress on belief, emphasis on belief was dropped, but Samaritanism preserved it with of course the substitution of Mount Gerizim for Zion. The antiquity of the Samaritan creed can be seen by the fact that there is no mention of the resurrection unless this is implied in the Day of Vengeance. By the fourth century Samaritans believed in the resurrection. In the Jewish Tractate Kuthim (i.e. Samaritans), which dates from between the second and third centuries, the question is asked, "When will we accept them (the Samaritans)?" To this the answer is given, "When they deny belief in Mount Gerizim and confess (faith in) Jerusalem and in the resurrection of the Dead". This statement is important because it shows that the Jews themselves demanded some sort of assent to a credal statement and further it is significant that the points wherein they want the Samaritans to be corrected are points 4 and 5 of the Samaritan creed. It goes without saying that Jew and Samaritan would agree on belief in God, in Moses and the Law. In which case we have from the Rabbinic side an unintentional testimony to the Samaritan creed. It is perhaps the oldest creed to have survived, and the importance of which is that it is a Hebrew creed, that its articles of faith are primitive and virtually uninfluenced by Hellenism. It would have been recited from the fourth century B.C. to summarize wherein Samaritans differed like the Jews from the heathen Seleucids and Ptolemies and also as Samaritans from the Jews themselves. It is, too, at this period that the Samaritan Sect finally broke with Judaism. Its importance lies in the fact that we need not wait until the fourth century A.D. for the emergence of a credal statement. The idea of a symbol of Belief such as eventually resulted in the Nicene Creed was not without precedent, even in a Hebrew milieu.

III. SAMARITAN LAW AND LITURGY

COWLEY (*Sam. Lit.*, O.U.P., 1909, vol. ii. p. xxi) probably did not realize how truly he had written when he stated: "The reading of the Law, . . . was no doubt the original, as it always remained

the essential, part of the Liturgy." Cowley was thinking of the fourth century A.D. and the work of Baba Raba, the great Samaritan leader of that period. But I venture to suggest that the reading of the Law had already long been established as the basis of synagogal worship, in fact that the reading of the Law, in certain fixed ways had been the main content of worship before the Samaritan schism. If one wants to form a picture of the liturgical service which formed a pattern for the conduct of Divine Service in the synagogue, we find it in Neh. viii on the one hand, and on the other in the Samaritan preparatory service held in the courtyard of their synagogue before the eve of Sabbath service at this present day. Both are entirely made up of readings from the Law.

Neh. viii raises certain problems. Actually there is a double narrative in this chapter as to how the reading of the Law took place and was carried through. In the first, Neh. verses 1-3, the people ask Ezra to come and read in the Law and this he does. In the second, Neh. verses 4 ff., the initiative is with Ezra, and the priests and Levites read the Law. Attention should be paid to what is read. They read *in* the Law. It is not all the words of the Law that are read as Josiah, cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 2, had "read all the words of the Book of the Covenant". Secondly they read the Law *Mephorash*.

Mephorash: this word has been variously understood. Both the R.V., "distinctly", or the R.V. margin, "with an interpretation", have had their defenders. The R.V. "distinctly" has much to commend it, in view of Ezra. iv. 18 where Mefarash describes how the king's letter was read. But does 'distinctly', while a safe translation, give the full sense of Neh. viii. 8? In this verse we are perhaps justified in calling in the evidence of Post-Biblical Hebrew. After all, where else does Mikra occur in the Bible in the sense it does in this sentence? The Rabbis, cf. T. B. Megillah 3a, understood Meforash here as meaning interpretation. But one ventures to ask whether Meforash refers to the Book and not to how they read. Are we to understand that the Book was divided up into sections? But even if this is inadmissible can it be that they read the Law divided into sections? The last two words of the sentence are translated in

the R.V. as "so that they understood the reading", or in the margin, "and caused them to understand the reading". Both are infelicitous. Mikra as "reading" in the O.T. is only here. True in Ber. ii. 1 and Meg. 3a Mikra means reading, but Sotah v. 2 gives two examples of Mikra as Biblical text or verse. Witton-Davies¹ was right in suggesting Mikra as section, and we would do well to translate the end of Neh. viii. 8 "and they understood each section."

Supposing that to be the correct translation of the last two words of Neh. viii. 8, what sort of section could we expect in the time of Ezra? It would certainly not be a verse. The earliest sections were the Parashiyyot not the fifty-four weekly Parashahs in the one yearly cycle, nor the 158 or 154 Sedarim of the three yearly cycle, but the small Parashahs or paragraphs. It is important to note that this use of "Parashah" as meaning "short section" or "paragraph" is old: e.g. in M. Sotah vii. 8 we are told how King Agrippa read the Law at the end of Sukkoth in the eighth year. This ceremony was held in the Temple Court, he and the priests were on a platform there erected. The origin of the ceremony is indebted to Deut. xxxi. 10 where the Priests, Levites etc. are to read the Law to the people at the close of the first day of Sukkoth in the eighth year, and to Deut. xvii. 18, 19 where the king is told to read the Law. That the ceremony mentioned in the Mishnah is indebted to Deut. xxxi. 9-13 is clear from the fact that Deut. xxxi. 10 is itself quoted in M. Sotah vii; but the Deuteronomic instruction regarding the king's reading of the Law implies only private study. Neh. viii is not cited in Mishnah Sotah vii. 8, nor is 2 Kings xxiii where we have the Biblical occurrence of a public reading of Deuteronomy to the people by the king. Yet Mishnah Sotah vii. 8 probably owes something to 2 Kings xxiii; e.g. the choice of the place of reading—the Temple Court. But Mishnah Sotah vii. 8 probably owes something to Neh. viii as to how it was read, e.g. on a platform specially set up. It may be that the connection as to how it was read both in Neh. viii and Mishnah Sotah vii. 8 does not end merely with that.

¹ *The Century Bible, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther*, p. 223.

In passing we might note that it could be argued that Neh. viii looks back to 2 Kings xxiii. Ezra takes the king's place in the reading of the Law ; for one or both of two reasons : (a) in this chapter, cf. the incident of Sukkoth, Neh. viii. 17, there is a recalling of the people to the practices of the days of Joshua, the accredited successor of Moses, just as 2 Kings xxiii recalls the people to the Mosaic Covenant. In any case Neh. ix which must be taken along with Neh. viii, is parallel to 2 Kings xxiii in that the people swear to abide by the Law. But (b) there is also the significant fact that in Neh. viii the priest takes the place of the king, probably denoting the beginning of the Theocracy. But as to the time when this event took place, in Sukkoth in the eighth year, Neh. viii stands near Deut. xxxi. 10, 11. But there may have been old elements in the picture given in Mishnah Sotah vii. 8. There we are told the sections—the Parashahs which the king read. These on the whole are small. Just how small a Parashah could be is to be seen from M. Taanith iv. 3 where it is stipulated that the Maamad who read daily in the Temple the verses of creation, Gen. i, appropriate to the day of the week, could split the Parashah if it was too long.

I suggest that the Torah was read to the people in Neh. viii. 8 in sections, not necessarily immediately consecutive sections, but sections representative of the teaching of the Law. Certainly that was what was done in M. Sotah vii. 8 by the king ; there, however, the sections were taken only from Deuteronomy—an obvious looking back to Deut. xvii. In the Modern Samaritan preparatory service before the eve of Sabbath service, the Law is read in the courtyard of the Synagogue not by one individual, but by all the Priests the Levites, cf. Neh. viii (note there is no valid reason to alter יִקְרָא verse 8 to the singular if we realize that in this section of that chapter, it is the Levites and possibly too the priests who are reading). The Parashahs in the modern Samaritan service range from the first chapter of Genesis to the end of Deuteronomy. The emphasis is on the Sabbath, and relevant Parashahs in the Law find considerable place, just as sections on Sukkoth were presumably read on the day which Neh. viii describes, cf. *ibid.* verses 14, 15. The Samaritan Parashahs of a manuscript written in 1944 are the same as those of

a MS. J.R.(G.) 1852 written in the seventeenth or eighteenth century. There is a long interval of time between the days of Ezra and the eighteenth century. It was probably soon after the people heard the Law read by Ezra and the priests the levites and had sworn to obey it, on this day that Neh. viii. purports to describe, that the Samaritans were cast off. If, of course, Neh. vii. 73b-x should really follow after Ezra x, schism had already started before the events recorded in Neh. viii. But the Samaritans have the same Torah as the Jews; true, there are variant readings, some of which are patently to the glory of Gerizim, yet in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Jewish we find section divisions which are in principle strikingly similar and which sometimes agree exactly. I refer to the Qatzim of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the little Parashah which correspond to the Petuhot and Setumot divisions of the Jewish Bible.

In the Samaritan Pentateuch MSS. the number of Qatzim in any one book of the Pentateuch is always carefully listed at the end of the book; we, of course, find the same thing done for the comparable Petuhot and Setumot divisions in the masorah of the Jewish Bible. In the printed Jewish Bible we find the Setumot and Petuhot marked by ׀ and ׆ respectively. The insertion of ׀ and ׆ to denote such divisions is found in late codices. Whereas Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* introduces the signa ׀ and ׆ the Leningrad Bible Codex, its basic text, (like also all the present day Synagogue Scrolls in this respect), indicates the Petuhah either by leaving an unfinished line with space for three triliteral words and beginning the new section on the next line; or if there is not such space at the end of the last line of the completed Petuhah, the next line is left entirely blank and the new open section begins on the line following that left vacant. The Setumah in the Leningrad Codex begins either with an indented line like that at the beginning of our paragraphs, if the previous line is filled; or if the previous section ends in the middle of the line, a minor break is made in the line, and the new Setumah section begins on the selfsame line as the previous one. From the amount of space left vacant between paragraph and paragraph, one could know by that alone whether the little parashah is setumah (closed) or petuhah (open). The proper way in which

either type of Parashah is to be written is set out in Masekta Sopherim ch. i, para. 18. The historical importance of Masekta Sopherim has in the last few years been vindicated by the Dead Sea MSS. The Petuhot and Setumot divisions were extended from the Torah to the Haftarat, though the Petuhot and Setumot of the latter have not been so rigidly established as those of the Torah. The Petuhot and Setumot divisions are already seen in the Qumran Isaiah texts. If the Petuhot and Setumot sectionalisation of the Torah precedes that of the Haftarat, then even if one does not accept my hypothesis that the Law was sectionalized for liturgical use before the Samaritan schism, yet such sectionalisation must date from before the second century B.C. If the Samaritans have borrowed from the Jews in this treatment of the text of the Law, it must have been no later than the middle of the fourth century B.C. Actually the Samaritans believe God revealed the Law to Moses in the existing Qatzim.

The late Haham Gaster in *Studies and Texts*, i. 503 ff., "The Biblical Lessons", seized on a highly significant fact that there is a real relationship between the paragraph divisions in the Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Samaritan Hebrew Text. But it is not enough to compare the first few chapters of Genesis as he did, cf. *ibid.* pp. 518-19 with striking results and then regard the matter established for the whole Law. In the first place there are 240 Qatzim in the Samaritan text of Genesis as against 43 Petuhot and 48 Setumot in the Masoretic Genesis. The Samaritans do not distinguish between Petuhot and Setumot; where the Samaritan Qatzim and Jewish Parashahs do agree, the Qatzim agree either with both Petuhot and Setumot or with the beginning of the one and ending of the other, or vice versa. It may be that the distinction between Petuhot and Setumot came not at the first stage in the paragraphing of the Pentateuchal text. But note the discrepancy in the paragraphing of Genesis, between 240 Qatzim on the one hand and 91 Parashahs (Petuhot and Setumot) on the other. In Exodus the Samaritan text has 200 Qatzim and the Jewish 98 Parashahs (Petuhot and Setumot). In Numbers the Samaritan has 218 Qatzim and the Jewish 158 Parashahs (Petuhot and Setumot). In Deuteronomy the Samaritan has 166 Qatzim and the Jewish 158 Petuhot and Setumot. In the whole Samaritan

Torah there are 960 Qatzim while in the Jewish there are 769 Parashahs both Petuhot and Setumot. It is plain that the Qatzim and the Jewish Parashahs are not by any manner of means identical. But examination shows that they are not all different. Some are indeed identical and those that are identical have played or still play a part in the Jewish or Samaritan Liturgy. Take for example Gen. i-ii. 3 which the Samaritans call the Qatze ha-Beria; there the Qatzim and Petuhot entirely agree. We know from M. Taanit iv. 3 of the liturgical use of Gen. i in the Temple service. Every Samaritan service begins with the Qatze ha-Beria. Take the Qatzim which are read as the preparatory service in the courtyard of the synagogue half an hour before the evening service begins. There are twenty sections read. Fourteen of these Qatzim agree entirely with Jewish paragraph divisions, some starting with Setumah and ending with Petuhah and vice versa it is true, however. The other six begin or end with one of the Jewish paragraph divisions. Or we may take the portions read by the High Priest in M. Yoma vii. 1, Lev. xvi. 1-34, Lev. xxiii. 26-32, Num. xxix. 7-11. The paragraphing of these citations agrees in both Samaritan and Jewish Bibles. Then again with the paragraphs of the king, cf. Mishnah Sotah vii, one finds complete agreement between Samaritan and Jewish paragraphing.

With the references in M. Megillah iii. 5 the sections of the Jewish Torah read at Pentecost, New Year, Tabernacles, and Rosh Hodesh agree with the Samaritan Qatzim exactly while the section read on the Day of Atonement is an aggregate of 6 Qatzim Lev. xvi. 1-34; the portion read on the Day of Fasting Lev. xxvi. 3-46 is itself three sections in the Jewish text, but eight Qatzim in the Samaritan, only the first of which Lev. xxvi. 3-13 agrees with one of the three Jewish divisions. But in the case of two of the readings by the High Priest for the Day of Atonement M. Yoma vii. 1, Lev. xxiii. 26-32 and Num. xxix. 7-11 we find absolute agreement between Samaritan and Jewish paragraph divisions. In the remaining reading Lev. xvi. 1-34 five Samaritan Qatzim are equivalent to one Jewish Petuhah. It is interesting that the High Priest after reading Lev. xvi. 1-34 and Lev. xxiii. 26-32 used to roll up the scroll of the Law, and put it in his bosom and

say, "More is written here than I have read out before you". In other words he read only the two selected Parashahs. In some of the above examples it can be argued that the places where the divisions are made are purely sense divisions and do not denote a common tradition. But the word for word agreement in the beginning and end of sections is, however, hardly other than the result of a common policy. A common policy existed only before the Samaritan schism, when it would seem likely that sections were indeed already chosen for liturgical use. It is more likely that only after the schism the *whole* Law would be divided into sections, not only so but it was thereafter that the Jewish recension was divided into two forms of paragraphs, Petuhot and Setumot.

The Samaritan weekday morning and evening services still stress the Law as the essential part of the Liturgy. In six days the whole Law is read in Qataf form. The whole series of Qetafim or digests read on the weekdays is gathered up and gone through again in the first half of the Samaritan Sabbath morning service, with one difference; this consists in references in the Sabbath recapitulation of the weekday Qetafim, to the Sabbath itself. Qetafim are a sort of digest of the Law, in the words of the Law; rarely full verses are used, but generally snippets of verses which in the Qetafim spread out over the six weekdays and recapitulated en bloc on Sabbath, make up an intelligible shortened form of the Law. The references to Sabbath in the Qataf of the Law read on Sabbath (of which consist the only points of difference between the ordinary Sabbath Qataf and that of the six weekdays) when listed, are found to be snippets of the Parashahs read at the preparatory service on the eve of Sabbath. This fact helps to establish the relation between Qetafim and Parashahs.

Having established a relationship between the references to the Sabbath in the Sabbath morning Qataf of the Law, and the full Parashahs dealing with the Sabbath, read at the Friday evening preparatory service, we can go farther and reconstitute from the rest of the Qetafim common to weekday and Sabbath what Parashahs were read by the Samaritans in the six weekdays and on the Sabbath morning service. First it is necessary to find

into what particular Qatz the individual piece or pieces of Qataf fall. It is interesting to note whether such Qatzim agree with Petuhot and Setumot divisions. Actually in the whole of Genesis, 4 Qatzim out of 64 agree with Jewish paragraphs; 11 Qatzim and Jewish Parashahs have a common beginning and one a common ending. In Exodus out of 51 Qatzim, 16 Qatzim and Jewish Parashahs completely agree, while 8 have a common beginning or ending. In Leviticus 4 Qatzim out of 23 entirely agree with Jewish Parashahs; 5 have the same beginning or ending as the Parashahs. In Numbers, 12 out of 39 Qatzim agree with Jewish Parashahs; 12 others have the same beginning or ending as Jewish Bible paragraphs. In Deuteronomy 16 Qatzim out of 64 agree with Jewish Parashahs; 20 others have the same beginning or ending. We may summarize the findings thus: there is complete correspondence between more than one fifth of the Qatzim from which the Qetafim are derived, and the Jewish Parashahs either Setumah or Petuhah. However, in addition, there are as many again which do show some point of contact. Therefore we may say that just under half of the Qatzim in question are identical or related in some way to Jewish Parashahs. The ratio is not constant for the various books, being higher for Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy than for Genesis. If one studies my tables of Qatzim, each of which is represented by a phrase or phrases in the Qataf of the whole Law read on Sabbath morning, one will see that to go through the whole series of these Qatzim *in toto* with the addition only of Tishbahot and Segudot makes a very lengthy service. It is likely that we have a twofold process at work in connection with the Qetafim. The Parashahs originally used were "Qataffed" to make space for liturgical compositions, and then when the Qataf form was established in the liturgy, Parashahs originally not represented, could now be drawn on to provide a word or phrase for the Qataf which now represents more Parashahs in the Torah than could ever have been originally read. Do those Qatzim and Parashahs which do agree represent a basic stock of passages read before the schism?

The actual form of the Qataf was established carefully, and one can find the very same sentences chopped up and affixed to

the very same other truncated sentences in Samaritan Liturgical MSS. of the twelfth or fourteenth centuries and those of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But the Qetafim were older than that. Already in the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, eighth or ninth century A.D., reference is made (ch xxxviii) to the Samaritans having the law in *Notarikon*—shorthand—an obvious but perhaps none too friendly reference to the Qetafim. Farther back we perhaps can go to a *Baraitha* on T.B. *Sotah* 35b that the *notarii* of the Ammin got the Law from the stones set up by Joshua (cf. Deut. xxvii. 2, 3, 4, Joshua ix. 4, 3, 6-32); and therefore their texts were defective. This may refer to the Samaritans and their abbreviated forms of the Law, their digests known as Qetafim. The Qataf form must be old, but it is likelier that the reading of passages in full, selected from throughout the whole Law, is older, since the custom is known and approved by both Jews and Samaritans; cf. *Mishnah Sotah* vii. 8 paragraphs of the king, and the Samaritan service for Sabbath eve.

If one wants to get a picture of a modern Samaritan service one should read *Neh. viii*. There we have reference to expressions of blessing and praise (verse 6) mentioned before the readings from the Law. In the days of Sukkoth mentioned at the end of the chapter they read Law every day, and on Sabbath, Sukkoth Festival and Shemini Asereth (these last two forming two Festivals). Of the days of Sukkoth five are ordinary days. I venture to maintain that what happened at that Sukkoth set the pattern for Samaritan Liturgy. They had there a pattern for weekday and Sabbath. When they left the Jews, they took the Law and a pattern of how to use the Law as liturgy. In the fourth century A.D. Marqah and Amram Darrah composed set liturgical compositions which were interposed between the free brief expressions of blessing and praise and the readings from the Law. But the brief expressions of blessing and praise also were retained. The Qataf form of reading the Law was introduced then into services to curtail the time spent on reading the Law even in Parashahs. The Law, every word of the five books, could not be read in one service. Already by the time of Ezra, or so the Chronicler thought, some definite section, division of the Law, had been achieved to allow for set representative passages of

the Law to be read in a manageable time in Divine Worship. The Samaritans adopted this, since it had been devised and approved before the schism. Later, when liturgical compositions were inserted, the Samaritans still contrived to give the Law the main place, if not the only place, in Divine Worship, by use of the Qataf form which allowed for even greater brevity of time in reading, but great comprehensiveness.

It is true to say that the Samaritans more than any other community in the Jewish nexus bear witness, albeit unwillingly, to the work of Ezra, as pictured in Neh. viii. The Law is still the central element in all their services. They have the yearly reading of the Law in fifty-four big Parashahs week by week at the noon service on Sabbath the climax of the week's devotion. Though these seldom agree with the Jewish Parashahs, like the Jews, the Samaritans begin the new yearly cycle of the reading of the Law at the end of Sukkoth. Like the Jewish yearly cycle the weekly Parashah, say at Passover, has nothing to do with the Passover story. The Samaritans, however, include in the Qataf at Passover complete sections from Exodus dealing with the Passover story. At the end of the morning service these complete sections are read again by themselves. Judaism, too, on Festivals inserts in the liturgy paragraphs from the Bible relating to the Festival in question. These, as also in the case of the Samaritan Qetafim and Festival Biblical paragraph readings, are read from the Prayer Book. Have we something in common here? Are the Biblical citations in the Jewish Festival Liturgy the last relic of a Jewish Divine service, based on readings of Parashahs from the Law, into which selections of Biblical paragraphs, pieces germane to any special Festival could be inserted? The old form of Divine Service, the reading of a cento of little Parashahs, a selection of small sections in full, is not dropped. The Samaritans are too conservative; it is relegated to the preparatory service before the eve of Sabbath service.

EVE OF SABBATH SAMARITAN PREPARATORY SERVICE

Gen. i. 31; Gen. ii. 1-3; Exod. xvi. 4-10; Exod. xvi. 11-21; Exod. xvi. 22-7; Exod. xvi. 28-36; Exod. xx. 8-11; Exod. xxiii. 10-13; Exod. xxiii. 20-7;

(Exod. xxx. 11-16 Said on the Sabbath of the Conjunction); Exod. xxxi. 12-17; Exod. xxxiv. 18-26; Exod. xxxv. 1-3; Lev. xix. 23-32; Lev. xxiii. 1-8; Lev. xxiii. 15-22; Lev. xxiv. 1-9; Lev. xxv. 47-xxvi. 2; Lev. xxvi. 3-13; Lev. xxvi. 42-6; Num. vi. 23-7; Num. x. 1-11; Num. xv. 32-6; Num. xxviii. 1-10; (Num. xxviii. 11-15 Said if the beginning of month occurs on the eve of the Sabbath); Deut. v. 12-15; Deut. vi. 4-9; Deut. vi. 20-5; Deut. x. 12-xi. 1; (Deut. xvi. 1-8 Said on Sabbaths of the First Month) (Deut. xxx. 11-14 Said on the last two Sabbaths before Pentecost); Deut. xxxi. 9-13; Deut. xxxiii. 1-7; Deut. xxxiii. 8-11; Deut. xxxiii. 12-17; Deut. xxxiii. 18-19; Deut. xxxiii. 20-1; Deut. xxxiii. 22-3; Deut. xxxiii. 24-7; Deut. xxxiii. 28-9; Deut. xxxiv. 1-4; Deut. xxxiv. 5-7; Deut. xxxiv. 8-9; Deut. xxxiv. 10-12.

QATZIM FROM WHICH THE QETAFIM ARE CONSTRUCTED

(The References are according to the Samaritan Hebrew Text as edited by Von Gall, *Der Hebraischer Pentateuch der Samaritaner* Giessen 1918.)

Gen. ii. 8-14; Gen. ii. 15-20; Gen. iii. 1-8; Gen. iv. 25-v. 2; Gen. v. 21-4; Gen. vi. 7-12; Gen. vi. 17-22; Gen. vii. 1-5; Gen. vii. 17-23; Gen. viii. 1-5; Gen. viii. 15-21a; Gen. viii. 21b-ix. 1; Gen. xii. 1-6; Gen. xii. 7-9; Gen. xiii. 14-18; Gen. xiv. 18-24; Gen. xv. 1-11; Gen. xv. 17-20; Gen. xvii. 1-8; Gen. xvii. 21-6; Gen. xviii. 13-19; Gen. xix. 18-23; Gen. xx. 1-7; Gen. xx. 14-18; Gen. xxi. 22-26; Gen. xxi. 27-33; Gen. xxii. 1-6; Gen. xxii. 7-10; Gen. xxii. 11-14; Gen. xxii. 15-19; Gen. xxiv. 1-7; Gen. xxiv. 10-14; Gen. xxiv. 34-41; Gen. xxiv. 42-51; Gen. xxiv. 62-7; Gen. xxv. 7-11; Gen. xxv. 19-28; Gen. xxvi. 1-5; Gen. xxvi. 12-23; Gen. xxvi. 24-35; Gen. xxvii. 21-33; Gen. xxviii. 1-9; Gen. xxviii. 16-22; Gen. xxxi. 11-16; Gen. xxxii. 4-9; Gen. xxxii. 10-14; Gen. xxxiii. 18-20; Gen. xxxv. 1-5; Gen. xxxv. 6-8; Gen. xxxv. 9-20; Gen. xxxvii. 1-4; Gen. xxxvii. 5-8; Gen. xxxvii. 29-36; Gen. xxxix. 1-6; Gen. xliii. 11-14; Gen. xlviii. 1-7; Gen. xlviii. 14-16; Gen. xlix. 16-18; Gen. xlix. 22-8; Gen. l. 24; Gen. l. 25; Gen. v. 26.

Exod. i. 1-7; Exod. ii. 1-10; Exod. ii. 23; Exod. iii. 6; Exod. iii. 7-13; Exod. iii. 14-17; Exod. iv. 2-5; Exod. vi. 2-9; Exod. vi. 20-28; Exod. ix. 27-34; Exod. xii. 13-20; Exod. xii. 21-8; Exod. xiv. 10-14; Exod. xiv. 19-25; Exod. xiv. 26-xiv. 31; Exod. xv. 1-18; Exod. xv. 22-6; Exod. xvi. 22-7; Exod. xvi. 28-36; Exod. xvii. 14-16; Exod. xviii. 8-12; Exod. xix. 1-9; Exod. xix. 21-5; Exod. xx. 1-7; Exod. xx. 8-11; Exod. xx. 12-17a; Exod. xx. 17b; Exod. xx. 18-21a; Exod. xx. 21b; Exod. xx. 22-6; Exod. xxii. 24-xxiii. 2; Exod. xxiii. 10-13; Exod. xxiii. 20-7; Exod. xxiii. 28-32; Exod. xxiv. 1-11; Exod. xxiv. 12-18; Exod. xxv. 1-9; Exod. xxvii. 9-19a; Exod. xxvii. 19b-21; Exod. xxviii. 1-5; Exod. xxviii. 15-21; Exod. xxviii. 22-30; Exod. xxviii. 36-43; Exod. xxix. 29-37; Exod. xxix. 38-46; Exod. xxxi. 12-17; Exod. xxxii. 9-14; Exod. xxxii. 21-9; Exod. xxxiii. 1-4; Exod. xxxiii. 5-11; Exod. xxxiii. 17-23; Exod. xxxiv. 1-9; Exod. xxxiv. 10-17; Exod. xxxiv. 18-26; Exod. xxxv. 1-3; Exod. xxxvi. 2-7; Exod. xxxix. 32-43; Exod. xl. 33-7.

Lev. ii. 4-16; Lev. iii. 12-17; Lev. vi. 1-6; Lev. vii. 11-21; Lev. ix. 12-21; Lev. ix. 22-x. 2; Lev. x. 8-10; Lev. xi. 39-47; Lev. xv. 25-33; Lev. xviii. 1-23; Lev. xix. 1-8; Lev. xix. 9-19; Lev. xix. 23-32; Lev. xix. 33-7; Lev. xxi. 1-9; Lev. xxi. 10-15; Lev. xxii. 26-33; Lev. xxiii. 1-8; Lev. xxiv. 1-9; Lev. xxvi. 1-2; Lev. xxvi. 3-13; Lev. xxvi. 42-6; Lev. xxvii. 34.

Num. iii. 1-4; Num. iii. 27-32; Num. iv. 13-16; Num. v. 5-10; Num. vi. 13-21; Num. vi. 22-7; Num. ix. 15-23; Num. x. 1-10a; Num. x. 10b; Num. x. 29-36; Num. xi. 1-10; Num. xii. 4-13; Num. xiv. 11-19; Num. xiv. 20-5; Num. xv. 1-7; Num. xv. 32-6; Num. xv. 37-41; Num. xvi. 1-7; Num. xvii. 1-5; Num. xvii. 6-8; Num. xvii. 9-15; Num. xviii. 20-4; Num. xx. 14-22; Num. xxi. 1-3; Num. xxi. 4-7; Num. xxiv. 1-2; Num. xxiv. 3-10; Num. xxv. 1-9; Num. xxv. 10-15; Num. xxvii. 12-17; Num. xxvii. 18-23b; Num. xxix. 35-xxx. 1; Num. xxxi. 1-8; Num. xxxi. 25-31; Num. xxxi. 32-41; Num. xxxii. 6-15; Num. xxxii. 28-32; Num. xxxiv. 16-29; Num. xxxvi. 13.

Deut. i. 1-8; Deut. i. 9-18; Deut. ii. 2-7; Deut. iii. 18-22; Deut. iii. 23-6; Deut. iv. 1-4; Deut. iv. 5-8; Deut. iv. 9-11; Deut. iv. 12-20; Deut. iv. 21-4; Deut. iv. 25-iv. 40; Deut. v. 1-5; Deut. v. 6-11; Deut. v. 12-15; Deut. v. 16; Deut. v. 17 (forming 4 Qatzim); Deut. v. 18a; Deut. v. 18b; Deut. v. 19-25; Deut. vi. 10-19; Deut. vi. 4-9; Deut. vi. 20-5; Deut. vii. 12-16; Deut. vii. 17-26; Deut. viii. 1-3; Deut. viii. 5-10; Deut. viii. 11-20; Deut. ix. 1-5; Deut. ix. 25-9; Deut. x. 12-xi. 1; Deut. xi. 2-9; Deut. xi. 22-30; Deut. xiii. 13-19; Deut. xiv. 1-8; Deut. xiv. 22-7; Deut. xviii. 9-16; Deut. xx. 1-9; Deut. xxi. 1-9; Deut. xxiii. 16-21; Deut. xxiv. 10-13; Deut. xxvi. 1-11; Deut. xxvi. 12-15; Deut. xxvii. 9-26; Deut. xxviii. 1-11; Deut. xxviii. 12-14; Deut. xxix. 9-12; Deut. xxxi. 1-6; Deut. xxxi. 7-8; Deut. xxxi. 9-13; Deut. xxxi. 16-18; Deut. xxxi. 19-21; Deut. xxxi. 24; Deut. xxxi. 25-9; Deut. xxxi. 30; Deut. xxxii. 1-43; Deut. xxxii. 44-7; Deut. xxxiii. 1-7; Deut. xxxiii. 28-9; Deut. xxxiv. 1-4; Deut. xxxiv. 5-7; Deut. xxxiv. 8-9; Deut. xxxiv. 10-12.

THE ROYAL HOUSE OF HANOVER AND THE BRITISH ARMY, 1714-60.

By JAMES HAYES, M.A.

GEORGE II was the last king of England to lead an army in battle, and it may be recalled that his strategic grasp and tactical understanding were by no means of a high order, since that same battle of Dettingen in 1743 saw George's mistakes redeemed only by the folly of the French commander who threw away the advantages proffered by royal ineptitude. Brave but stupid must be the verdict upon his abilities as a commander.¹

Unfortunately for George his shortcomings in the field mask the very real services that he rendered the British army in the course of forty-five years, as Prince of Wales and, from 1727, as king of England. This was in the nature of a family contribution. The royal house of Hanover rendered the army service of considerable worth in three generations, in the persons of George I and II and the latter's second son William Augustus, duke of Cumberland, whose merit is perpetually obscured by his unfortunate nickname of "the butcher", acquired during the suppression of the Forty-Five in Scotland. By personal effort they preserved the army from the dangers that threatened its efficiency from parliamentary influence and interference, and from the hazards of peace which its unco-ordinated state made it ill-qualified to meet. In so doing, in introducing various highly necessary measures and, above all, in giving the army and its officers a personal lead, they created the efficient and experienced force which helped to win the Seven Years' War on land for Britain. The battle of Minden, all the military glories of the *annus mirabilis*, and the successes of other years, were as much due to the Hanoverian monarchs and

¹ For a description of the battle see Sir J. W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, ii (1910), pp. 93-102. The king behaved with great gallantry. He was in the field of battle the whole time, and on being beseeched by his attendants not to expose himself so much he replied, "What do you think I came here for, to be a poltroon?" (*Historical Manuscripts Commission, Chequers Court MSS.* (1900), pp. 253, 260-1).

their royal prince as to the bravery of the officers and men who fought their battles. This has not been given the recognition which is its due.¹

To appreciate this it is necessary to return to the time of the Hanoverian succession. When peace was signed in 1713 the prospects of the officers and men of the army were unassured. A war which, with one intermission, had lasted a generation had just been concluded and a long period of uninterrupted peace was confidently forecast and eagerly expected by all. The army was greatly reduced in size. Most of its members were cast upon half-pay with little prospect of returning to full employment and the happy few retained for service were conveniently forgotten.²

¹ This side of their activities has long been neglected, if not altogether ignored, and has certainly never been explored in detail. Fortescue's *History* and his contribution to the symposium *Johnson's England* (1933) are very perfunctory in their notice and are of little use in this respect. The relevant passages of Basil Williams' volume in the *Oxford History of England* are no better, though he does acknowledge that George I and George II "insisted on having a decisive voice in the organization and direction of the army" and concedes that Cumberland "initiated several useful reforms" (p. 207). The articles in the *Dictionary of National Biography* hardly mention their interest in military affairs and neglect to consider the duke's reforms, whilst the two-volume life of Cumberland by Evan Charteris (1913, 1925) is disappointing on the subject of reform. F. H. Skrine's "*Fontenoy*" (1906) is interesting but insufficient, whilst S. Pargellis' *Military Affairs in North America 1748-65*, compiled largely from the Cumberland Papers in the Royal Archives at Windsor, contains some material relevant to the present subject.

In short, detail is almost completely lacking, and nothing new has been produced for many years. This article is an interim attempt to remedy the omission and is based on material collected, for the most part, during two years of study for an M.A. thesis in the University of London on an allied subject. Its justification lies partly in the present *lacuna*, and partly in that, though unable for the present to continue the study in detail because of overseas service, the material already collected appears to warrant an attempt at synthesis. Respecting the Cumberland Papers, which date for the most part from 1745 onwards, though useful for the period of the duke's reforms, they are of little use for the military activities of his father and grandfather, save for 150 letters written by George II in 1757. There are very few of their papers at Windsor, and it is not certain whether the main body of them have survived. They may be in Hanover, and the Royal Librarian is enquiring into the possibility at the moment.

² The rising of 1715 caused a great many to be recalled for service, but its suppression saw the majority relegated once more to slender means and obscurity. Many of these officers stayed ten or even twenty years on half-pay before being restored to employment. Walter Molesworth, an experienced captain of dragoons, deprecated his own and his brother Richard's chances of getting back to full pay.

The army that settled down to peace-time soldiering was ill-fashioned to withstand the onslaught of privilege, and even less so to combat the insidious dangers of peace itself and the lethargy it would bring in its train. At this time it was an army only in name. It consisted of a congeries of separate regiments, unco-ordinated save for the barest administrative supervision. There were no brigades, divisions, or headquarters staffs, as we know them today, and the regiments were entirely individual entities, responsible for recruiting, clothing, equipping,¹ training and generally looking after themselves, under shadowy government directives. There was no such thing as a prescribed and uniform system of drill and weapon-training, nor were there any concerted manœuvres above the level of an occasional field day in which a few companies or, at best, a regiment or two took part. With regiments scattered about the face of the country in small detachments, instead of being grouped in larger formations and housed in camps or barracks, little else could be expected. Duties in aid of the civil power, in effect home-policing, were the lot of the military in the united kingdoms. There was no organized system of inspection in time of peace. All that was done depended almost entirely upon the colonels and lieutenant-colonels of the individual regiments. Generally speaking, their imagination or lethargy had scope to run its full course. It is easy to see how such an army could deteriorate when the spur of active service was removed.²

Privilege, however, constituted the more pressing danger, "Things stand as they did in regard to the gallant colonel and I", he informed his eldest brother. "These dragoon captains and colonels are immortal". It was seven years before they were both employed again (Molesworth MSS., *H.M.C., Various Collections*, viii. 280).

¹ With the exception of arms and ammunition which were supplied by government from the Tower of London and other arsenals.

² For an account of the administrative machinery of the army at this time see volume i of Major-General A. Forbes' three-volume *History of the Army Ordnance Services* (1929), which is the most useful and the most detailed account available. Though relating to a later period, E. E. Curtis, *The Organisation of the British Army in the American Revolution* is also of use. Fortescue's relevant volume is weak on administration. A valuable contemporary account is the Report on the State of His Majesty's Land Forces and Marines, June 1746 in *Reports from Committees of the House of Commons* (1803), ii, *Miscellaneous subjects 1738-65*, pp. 75-211.

since it provided the means to encourage and accelerate the disintegratory influences already in being. In the army privilege was construed by influence—"interest", as the eighteenth century designated it—and by parliamentary influence in particular. The social composition of the officer group and the manner in which officers were obtained and their promotion regulated made the army particularly susceptible to parliamentary wire pulling. At least one-quarter of the officers of the army were obtained from among the immediate offspring of the titled and untitled land-owning class, and since this class provided the majority of members of parliament its political predominance ensured that its sons, relatives and protégés would not want for assistance in their chosen career.¹ The highest posts went invariably to officers from this class, who throughout the period under review held most of the senior appointments, including the majority of the financially-rewarding colonelcies of regiments.² This situation obtained largely because of two things: the fact that promotion

¹ In his autobiographical fragment Arthur Onslow, Speaker of the House of Commons 1728-61, narrates how he established his younger brother Richard in the Army and did his best for him thereafter. Richard became a lieutenant-general, colonel of one of the troops of Horse Grenadier Guards and governor of Plymouth. "What part I have had in all except the last (Plymouth) of particular military commands in his after promotions, and in other benefits to him", commented Arthur obliquely, "he best knows" (*H.M.C. 14th Report*, Part ix (1895), pp. 501-2).

² Between 1714 and the end of the Seven Years' War in 1763 there were 374 appointments to the proprietary colonelcies. (This number is exclusive of the twenty colonels who were dismissed from the army because of their Jacobite leanings within a year of George I's succession, and of the regimental commanders of many of the new levies raised during the second half of the Seven Years' War who, probably for political considerations, were not colonels proper but had the rank of major or lieutenant-colonel commandants.) Of this number around 170 were owners of landed estates at the time of their death, and a further 100 who were younger sons of peers and baronets, and of untitled country gentry, equally divided, may be added; for though not themselves men of property they were close to the landed interest and formed an integral part of it. Of the group remaining, about a third came from the educated middle and professional class, including a number who were the sons of career officers with little besides their pay; another third were first or second generation Huguenot refugees; and the remainder I have been, up to the present time, unable to trace. These figures were compiled during work on a thesis now deposited in the University of London library and the Institute of Historical Research, which examined the social and professional background of the officers of the Army 1714-63.

went essentially by purchase, that is, by the acquisition of rank for money ; and the way in which preferment was managed. The first ensured that as a rule only men with the necessary wealth would qualify for the higher ranks, and the second, which was conditioned by " interest " of one kind or another, especially by parliamentary " interest ", ensured that only those who could command influence would usually be successful. The channels through which promotion matters were conducted made this almost a certainty. The king decided all matters of promotion : his signature was an essential feature of an officer's commission. But for all save the highest appointments, applications went first to the War Office whose head, the secretary at war, in effect the king's private secretary for military affairs, placed them before the monarch. Since this official was a politician it follows that parliamentary " interest " was a powerful adjunct to successful promotion. It could hardly be otherwise.

The army was thus bedevilled by the inescapable fact that its promotion was in large measure determined by political " interest ". Military preferment was essentially a branch of political patronage, in which jobs could be managed to placate, induce and reward men with votes and followings in parliament.¹ In this way was the king's government maintained. Everything conspired to make privilege the dominant influence in the army and without a curb on purchase and some restraint on parlia-

¹ The period is noteworthy for a marked increase in the number of serving officers sitting in both Houses, colonels and above for the most part. They could therefore take an active part in securing their own promotions. The number of colonels sitting in Parliament was high. Significantly nearly all of them came from the landed group detailed above. 113 of the colonels were members of the lower house at some stage of their career, usually during the latter part of it, and twenty-seven who were English peers and twelve who were elected Scottish peers sat in the upper house during this period, making a total of 152 parliamentarians out of the 374 colonels under consideration. This figure is confined to officers actually holding regimental colonelcies, and it would be increased were officers included who held colonel's or general officer's rank alone, that is, without a regiment. There were also a considerable number of colonels in the two houses of the Irish parliament. Besides the group of colonels, there was a lesser number of regimental officers in the English parliament, so that the total military " interest ", which was part of the landed " interest " rather than one in itself, was quite appreciable.

mentary "interest" the situation could be exploited almost indefinitely, with most serious results.

Among the many dangers arising from the undue exercise of privilege two were particularly serious, because of their impact upon the regimental officers and the efficiency of their regiments. It was too easy for officers with parliamentary interest to represent their various needs, particularly for leave of absence, direct to the secretary at war instead of to their regimental superiors, and in the absence of a secretary with scruples and some sense of the responsibilities of his office this could lead to great injustice. Moreover, this kind of privilege superimposed on their initial advantage in promotion matters might be calculated to have the worst effects upon the moral of the rest of the officer group, many of whom did not possess any "interest". The discipline, morale and efficiency of the regimental officers were gravely endangered in consequence. Over-privilege had a vast potential for doing harm, so weakening the already precarious structure of the army. From the direction of purchase another danger threatened, and this was a serious one since it might well have impeded the Crown's ability to make changes for the better. It was occasioned by the gradual extension of purchase to include even the colonelcies of regiments which was becoming increasingly noticeable by the year 1714. If colonelcies were to be bought and sold like so many commercial concerns a business ring would come into being that would by its very nature make reform very difficult to achieve, particularly since the colonels were securely buttressed in parliament. This was a peril of which, it would seem, the Crown was not aware,¹ and it was only averted because George I detested purchase in all its manifestations and was concerned to find that its operation would prevent him from rewarding deserving officers whose means did not measure up to their merit.

All these were evils capable of effortless expansion were their progress allowed to continue unchecked. In the first few years

¹ Action must speak in place of words in this matter since recorded utterances on the subject are few : but what evidence there is leads one to conclude that such was the case, and that the army was saved from the menace of complete "ownership" only because the Georges disliked "purchase" and did not like to see colonelcies changing hands between rich officers to the virtual exclusion of others who were deserving men but not so well endowed with this world's riches.

after the peace the traditions of the war and the liveliness caused by the Jacobite rising prevented their full potential being realized ; but had not a prince come to the throne who was intensely interested in his army, was resentful of undue parliamentary interference with it, and was by no means willing to let his politician secretary at war be anything but his servant and mouthpiece,¹ the probability is that the worst features of the

¹ The position of the secretary at war in this period bore many anomalies, besides the one that is generally cited when the office is discussed, i.e. that he had power without parliamentary responsibility. His power itself was subject to fluctuation, in that he could have much or very little. Measured by the extent to which he could control military patronage and effect favours for people, it would vary in direct proportion to the interest his sovereign took in his army. All military patronage was the king's, to be controlled and dispensed as he willed. In theory the secretary at war was the latter's private secretary for military affairs and was only the mouthpiece and instrument of his royal master ; but under a weak or a disinterested king he could usurp the royal powers and could make himself a powerful personage through the control he could exert over army patronage, particularly if he was able to view his charge with cynical indifference. Under the early Georges the practice of the situation did correspond with its theory, although Sir John Fortescue did not think so when he wrote the second volume of his *History* (1910). This view did not escape challenge at the time. See C. Dalton, *George the First's Army*, 2 vols. (1912), ii, p. xxv.

Fortescue's exaggeration sprang from his conviction that even in his own day political influence in the army was too powerful ; and since he had a poor opinion of the army in the first half of the eighteenth century, whose shortcomings he traced to Walpole and his system of government, whereby "politicians had assumed command of the army", he was prompted to conclude of the earlier period, "The roots of the evil lay far deeper then than now in the overweening supremacy of the Secretary at War" (*ibid.* ii. 27). He does not do justice to the figure of the monarch in control of the army, nor to the amount of improvement which the Hanoverians managed to achieve by their reforms and their wholesome attitude. It is inevitable therefore, that he apports too much power to the secretaries who, in reality, remained such, though their opportunities for effecting jobs was still considerable. The secretaries themselves seem to have been aware of the niceties of their position. William Pulteney, later earl of Bath, wrote in 1717, "A Secretary-at-War is a ministerial, not a constitutional, office, bound to issue orders according to the King's directions" (*Dalton*, ii. p. xxv), which, as he told one sufferer, "I must own do's Sometimes subject me to the performance of some ungratefull tasks, as it does in this Particular." Deploing his inability to help, he continued, ". . . I am conscious my Self how little Weight my Opinion or Advice can deserve with his Ma^{ty}. And therefore I have hitherto on no Acct ever presumed to give it. All I aim at is faithfully to Execute Whatever Commands his Ma^{ty} shall give me and by my fidelity (the only way I have) endeavour to render my Self in some measure deserving of the hon^r he has done me in putting me into this Office" (Public Record Office, W.O.4/17, fols. 136-7). The actions and

army's situation would have been exploited, with disastrous results.

George I appears to have been horrified with the army he inherited from his predecessor. Quickly he decided that action must be taken to curb the iniquities that marred it in his sight. The greatest of these was the purchase system. The buying and selling of the various commissioned ranks had been regarded with disfavour by William and Anne;¹ but against the vested interests constituted by the vast corporation of serving officers they could do little but introduce regulations that were largely ignored. Coming from a German state where purchase was not a feature of military promotion, George was determined to put a stop to the practice. He made no secret of his attitude which was one of the strongest disapproval. In 1714 he stigmatized it as "that Evil Practice", and two years later his secretary at war wrote to one colonel, ". . . it is scarce possible for any who has not applied to the King to conceive the great aversion he always expresses upon the mention of leave for any officer to dispose of his commission, and everybody is discouraged from speaking on that head".² However, even George with his authoritarian tenets was powerless against the business ring. Although he made determined efforts to prohibit purchase several times in his reign³ the system had

phraseology adopted by later secretaries seem to indicate a similar attitude. The whole question of the relations between the first two Hanoverian kings and their secretaries at war, and their relative share in the direction of the army, has yet to be the subject of a detailed modern investigation.

¹ For an account of William and Anne's warrants see C. M. Clode, *The Military Forces of the Crown* (2 vols., 1869), ii. 75-9.

² Quoted by Clode, ii. 606-7.

³ Several royal warrants endeavoured to encompass the practice within strict regulations which emphasized the sole authority of the king in such matters, restricted selling to those who had already bought, regulated price and enjoined strict adherence to the tariff-scale introduced. The royal warrants of February 1720 and March 1722 are quoted in Clode, ii. 79 ff. It is unfortunate that so few copies of these and other warrants seem to have survived. No collection of them has been made at the British Museum, the Public Record Office or the War Office Library. Where copies have been preserved, it seems to have occurred by chance. There is a copy of the 1720 warrant in the P.R.O., S.P. (Domestic) 41/5; and a copy of George III's warrant of 1766 is included among Lord John Murray's papers deposited with the Bagshawe Muniments in The John Rylands Library, in the bundle 5/2/16-57. There must be others. Besides the warrants, which were not altogether successful, George from time to time would become obstinate

roots which went too deep to be easily dislodged. Too many officers had purchased and had a recognised right to sell, violation of which would occasion serious dissatisfaction with the monarch. The army was powerfully entrenched in parliament among the land-owning classes who provided the army with so many of its officers. George could not afford to make such a blatant attack on property.¹ At the same time there was much that he could do to reduce the number of purchase negotiations and to ensure that less fortunate officers were treated with some degree of fairness and consideration. In his capacity as commander-in-chief the king had the final word in the selection of officers to fill vacancies. He could therefore refuse to countenance the more objectionable transactions that were put before him, and he could appoint whom he wished to fill the non-purchase vacancies created when any officer died or when he himself decreed that the officer making the vacancy had no right to sell.² All of these things he did, paying due regard to merit and seniority whenever he could. It was also a cardinal point of his policy to bring back deserving officers from the half-pay list, to which they had been consigned against their will at the end of the wars. In so doing he earned the loyalty and gratitude of all professional officers who felt, rightly, that here was someone with a real concern for their interests.

By making his influence felt in this way George accustomed his officers to look to the monarch rather than to the politicians

about permitting purchase negotiations to proceed. In February 1717 Richard Worthington, agent to Rich, fifth viscount Irwin's 16th Regiment of foot, was told by Mr. Merrill, the Secretary at War's deputy, that the king "wou'd not any longer give leave to the Custom of Selling and buying Commissions but more especially when the Seller had not bought . . .", and at the same time Lord Cobham was refused permission to change two of the officers of his regiment of dragoons by purchase. See Irwin Papers, Central Library, Leeds, fols. 82, 87. A later instance is to be found in P.R.O., W.O.4/25, fol. 21.

¹ The Journals of the House of Commons might provide useful material for an assessment of the parliamentary opposition to George's purchase reforms, nothing of which is known at the present time.

² The letterbooks of his secretaries at war in the P.R.O. provide much evidence of this, e.g. W.O.4/22, fols. 24-5, W.O.4/25, fol. 116. George II felt exactly the same on these points, e.g. W.O.4/46, fol. 338 and many places elsewhere, also Bagshawe MSS. 2/2/317.

for a lead in military affairs,¹ and his son's equally great interest in his army ensured that the situation continued to develop in this way. The assumption of this key position at the summit of the military pyramid was stressed by Frederick the Great, later in the century, as being of the utmost importance in the creation of a professional *Offizierkorps* such as he and his predecessors established in Prussia.² To a lesser extent George I and George II did this in England, under the different social and political circumstances in which they found themselves. Officers did become accustomed to look to the king for their rewards and encouragement,³ although they did not always receive them from suspicious and ungracious majesty.⁴

The success of any attempt to create a professional *Offizierkorps* on the German model, which is what the Hanoverian monarchs

¹ In 1734 Cuthbert Ellison of Hebburn, a north country gentleman who was major of the 8th Dragoons in Ireland, wrote from his quarters in Dublin to say he would shortly be home on leave and must go to London, "since it is both my Duty and Interest to pay my court to his Majesty, as I have never been presented to him since he pleas'd to make me a Field Officer" (Carr-Ellison MSS., Central Library, Gateshead-on-Tyne, A 18, letter of 19 March 1733/34).

² For a detailed account of Frederick's measures, and for those of his father, see K. Jany, *Geschichte der Königlichen Preussischen Armee* (4 vols., 1928-30), i. 722-37, ii. 219-36.

³ Although they still looked to politicians in hopes of preferment, particularly to the important members of an administration who could reasonably expect to have some at least of their wishes gratified. When George II refused to give a regiment to George Stanhope, a Guards officer of reasonable seniority, Lord Chesterfield, his patron and at the time one of the secretaries of state, was so put out by this display of royal intransigence that he said, "he believed he was the first Secretary of State that could not get an old Lieutenant-Colonel, though before it was his rank, into a regiment, and that he was not sure his protection had not hurt him" (*Marchmont Papers*, ed. Sir G. Rose (3 vols., 1831), i. 225-7, 214, 252 for the whole affair).

⁴ Samuel Bagshawe, a Derbyshire country gentleman and a protégé of the duke of Devonshire, and by all accounts a first-class officer, was refused promotion to a colonelcy by George II. "How can he serve, wanting a leg and an eye?", he enquired testily of Sir John Ligonier, the commander in chief, who had presented his petition, unmindful of the fact that poor Bagshawe had lost both in his service (John Rylands Library, B 15/1/28). For a full account of Bagshawe, the regiments in which he served, and his brother officers and acquaintances of a generation's soldiering (1730-62), see his papers which are deposited with the rest of the Bagshawe Muniments in The John Rylands Library, Manchester, probably the largest collection of papers relating to the military history of this period, and certainly the most important.

seem to have tried to do almost as a matter of instinct, was bound to be affected by the degree to which political influence in promotions and appointments could be excluded or controlled. The mechanism of eighteenth-century government in England made it impossible to exclude political influence from the army, but the Georges did their best to keep it under reasonable control. They felt very strongly on the subject, and any display of undue parliamentary "interest" was calculated to rouse them thoroughly. Lord Hervey records what Sir Robert Walpole had to say to him about George II in this connection :

How many people there are I could bind to me by getting things done in the army you may imagine, and that I can never get any one thing done in it you perhaps will not believe ; but it is as true as that there is an army that I never ask for the smallest commission by which a Member of Parliament may be immediately or collaterally obliged, that the King's answer is not " I won't do that ; you want always to have me disoblige all my old soldiers ; you understand nothing of troops ; I will order my army as I think fit ; for your scoundrels of the House of Commons you may do as you please ; you know I never interfere, nor pretend to know anything of them, but this province I will keep to myself ".¹

Sir Robert was probably speaking in a moment of exasperation, since there was much that he could accomplish in the army ;² but if the detail is exaggerated the substance is correct. George II did not like parliamentary "interest" to operate in his army, but this could not, unfortunately, prevent politicians from exercising a profound influence upon military promotions. As has already been pointed out, military patronage was one of the means employed by government to produce favourable political results,

¹ Ed. R. R. Sedgwick, *Lord Hervey's Memoirs* (1931), pp. 771-2. See also 707-8.

² A good example is to be found in *H.M.C., Carlisle MSS.*, in 15th *Report*, part 6 (1897), pp. 137-8. In 1734 the Hon. Charles Howard, a younger son of the third earl of Carlisle, became colonel and aide-de-camp to his majesty, after eighteen years service. He had been in parliament as member for Carlisle since 1727, and was a supporter of Sir Robert Walpole, to whom his new post was entirely owing. How it came about is detailed in a letter to his father : " Towards the latter end of this session Sir Robert shewed me a good deal of civility, and told me he had something to propose to me which he believed I should like. I went to him ; his proposal did not suit my inclinations, so after thanking him for his offer, told him, if he thought me deserving any mark of the King's favour, I rested it with him, and did not doubt but that he might have an opportunity of taking notice of me. In about a fortnight after, he told me there was Groom of the Bedchamber to the King, or his Aid de Camp, vacant ; that he could carry either for me ; which did I choose ? "

and for this reason alone the army could never be free from parliamentary influence.

This was particularly the case when colonelcies and posts of profit had to be filled. These frequently became the pawns in political manœuvres. The appointment of William, eighth earl of Home to the colonelcy of the 48th Regiment in 1750 was the result of protracted bargaining between the ministers and the duke of Argyll, whose protégé Home was. The substance of the agreement was that if Home was given a colonelcy Argyll would withdraw his opposition to the re-election of Lord Marchmont as a representative Scottish peer, which was effectually blocking Marchmont's return to the political scene.¹ And when William, first earl Cadogan died in July 1726 the disposal of his regiment, the First Guards, was bound up with the expediency of conferring a regiment upon John, second duke of Argyll who, although restored to favour since he was removed from all his employments in 1717, had not been given back his regiment. Ten days intervened between the earl's death and the reshuffle of appointments, during which time frenzied intrigues took place. "I never in my whole life time was possessed with so many hopes and fears as I have been since Saturday last", wrote one of Duncan Forbes of Culloden's London friends, "The whole Ministers say and swear, that they will do their utmost to satisfy him [Argyll], I hope they will, for their own sakes, the Kings and Countrys sake and the honest worthy gallant mans quiet". Argyll got a regiment, but the issue was long in doubt.²

It seems fairly clear that as far as the distribution of colonelcies

¹ See the story of the transactions, narrated in rather equivocal and evasive language, in *Marchmont Papers*, i. 224, 265-7. Such manœuvring was quite common, and widely recognized. In 1721 Colonel Richard Molesworth had been three years on half-pay after his dragoon regiment had been disbanded, and there was no sign of his re-appointment as colonel of another, whereupon his father, the first viscount, told his elder brother that he might be sure they would do nothing for Richard out of his turn, "and upon the falling of a regiment they make such bargains that nobody can guess when it will come to his turn . . ." (*H.M.C., Molesworth MSS., in Various Collections* viii (1913), 313). The father was in a position to know since he had been a member of the English Commons for many years and was a junior office holder. Richard was a keen and competent officer; see *ibid.* preface and pp. 268-9.

² Ed. D. Warrand, *More Culloden Papers* (1923-30), iii. 6-8.

was concerned the king's hands were partially tied and that his decisions were largely made for him by the politicians who carried on his government. It was difficult for it to be otherwise. On the other hand, a survey of the appointments to colonelcies in the two reigns shows that despite the limitations imposed by political expediency the officers promoted to colonelcies were deserving of them, by virtue of their experience and length of service in the subordinate ranks.¹ This, in turn, indicates that the officer-structure of the individual regiments of the army was fundamentally sound, and that George could assent to these "political" promotions without having to make any undue compromise with his conscience and opinions. This situation was undoubtedly the fruit of the Hanoverians' general policy which ensured that officers could arrive at lieutenant-colonels' rank, and so be eligible for promotion to colonel, only after a certain period of time. There were no real short-cuts.

In the disposal of the junior commissions the king had a more effective say, since they were not, to some extent, such important tokens of political power. "Interest", however, was still the predominating factor, and merit was in consequence often put on one side.² Unless it was possessed to a superlative degree, merit was unlikely to advance any poor and obscure officer far upon the promotion ladder, unless he could attract the attention of

¹ Of over 290 officers appointed to colonelcies between 1714 and 1763 (there were also 81 colonels appointed in previous reigns who continued to serve the new monarch) nearly 20 had served for over forty-five years before being given a regiment; another 60 had served between thirty-five to forty-four years; and a further 70 had served for over twenty-five. In other words, over half the colonels appointed within the period had served for upwards of a generation before receiving a regiment as the reward of their labours. Of the remainder, 90 had over fifteen years service and 40 had served ten years or over.

² This was, unfortunately, too often the case; but there were commanding officers high-minded enough to help their less fortunate brethren. In 1762 Samuel Bagshawe assisted Lieutenant Hercules Ellis of his regiment to purchase a company out of his own pocket, an act that was much appreciated. Of this officer, a veteran of the earlier war of 1739-48 who had been wounded at Laffeldt, Bagshawe's Scottish major wrote, "Was Ellis to Call for a Character I should very readily say what I know to be true, that he is a Diligent Carefull Officer in the Station he is in. Tho I do not think him fitt to Command Armys, You cannot imagine what Pleasure it gives me that you have taken a care of that Man." (John Rylands Library, Bagshawe MSS. 2/1/36.) Bagshawe's action was by no means unique, which helped to redress the balance.

influential men. In some respects personality was a more useful quality for such an officer to have. The situation was quite disheartening, and to none more so than a conscientious secretary at war and a monarch who wanted to do what was right. The stream of applications and recommendations never ceased to flow, coming, for the most part, from members of both houses and their friends, or bearing their name. After years of office as secretary at war (1755-61, and again 1765-78) Lord Barrington told one of his correspondents that he had adhered to fixed principles in adjusting promotions, "despite dangers from some hundred unreasonable Parliament men, supported by unreasonable but powerful patrons". He harboured no illusions on the subject of parliamentary "interest" and its exponents in the House. "Many years of my life have been spent in warfare against these gentlemen", he remarked in the same letter.¹

It was quite impossible, without a complete change of system, to make an effective stand against the torrent. Since this was not practical, all that could be attempted was a refusal to countenance the worst cases that were placed before them. Jobbery did continue, seemingly unabated in volume, but it was jobbery within bounds, reduced to manageable proportions. There were very few regiments that were not commanded by mature and experienced officers, with seasoned majors and captains to assist them, even at the height of the great expansion of the army in the Seven Years' War. In fact, the officer-structure of any regiment in the latter half of the period under review would bear a close comparison with that of any infantry battalion of today, when regimental promotion is regulated solely by seniority. Under the circumstances of the time this amounts to quite an achievement and it was due very largely to the Hanoverians' dislike of purchase and undue parliamentary interest, and to their determination to regulate promotion according to fixed principles whenever that was possible. Their attitude counted for a great deal.

Besides doing their best to curb parliamentary "interest", the Georges turned their attention to the discipline of their officers, more particularly to their tendency to be absent from

¹ Shute Barrington, *The Political Life of William Wildman, viscount Barrington*.

duty whenever it suited their private purposes or inclination. There seems to have been a tacit recognition of certain rules before the accession of the Hanoverians,¹ but how far these had had or would have any effect in time of peace when duty was slack is indeterminable: the country had been at war too long. The merit of the latter's work lies most likely not in the fact that they introduced anything new, but in that they re-formulated the existing regulations and did their best to see that officers complied with them in time of peace. It was the insistence upon compliance with their regulations that marked the Georges one and all. Early in his reign George I drew up the "Regulations for the Attendance of Officers in their Quarters".² No copy of this has come to my notice, but it appears to have limited legitimate leave of absence to include up to one-third of each rank at any one time and it reiterated the old ruling that under no circumstances were both the lieutenant-colonel and the major of any regiment to be away from it together. That George meant

¹ See P.R.O., W.O.4/17, fol. 39 for one instance.

² For references to it see P.R.O., W.O.4/25, fols. 19, 125 and elsewhere in the series of letterbooks: but despite recurrent mention of it no actual copy of the regulations appear therein, not even for the year and month of its appearance; and there seems to be no copy retained in the relevant S.P. (Dom.) 45, though it is possible there is one tucked away haphazardly in one of the volumes in that series. However, it was copied for the better regulation of the regiments on the Irish military establishment and there is a hand-written copy of the Irish order in that volume of the Tyrawley Papers relating to Ireland 1716-29, during part of which time the second Lord Tyrawley was a general officer on the staff there (B.M., Add. MS. 23, 636). The provisions of the regulation are obviously the same as must have appeared in the English version, and only the preamble and style have been changed to suit the Irish government. The London Gazette, too, contains no copy of the original instruction, but there is an indication of the fact that the king's patience was exhausted several months before it went forth in the following order, which appears in the Gazette under the date 14 February 1716-17. "It is His Majesty's Pleasure, that all Officers belonging to the Land-Forces, in Great Britain, do repair forthwith to their respective Posts, notwithstanding any Furlow or Leave of Absence whatsoever to the contrary upon pain of His Majesty's severest Displeasure. And it is His Majesty's further Command, that all Colonels or Officers Commanding in Chief any of the Regiments in His Majesty's Service in Great Britain, do return to the Secretary at War's Office, within 15 Days at the farthest from the Date hereof, a List, attested by them, of the Officers absent at that Time from their Posts, with the Reasons of their Absence. By His Majesty's Command, William Pulteney" [Secretary at War]. This outburst appears to have been prompted by no other motive than righteous indignation.

business is evident from his secretary at war's letters to offenders. They were ordered to return to their duty and warned that they would be superseded if they failed to comply, which was the penalty several of them paid for their prolonged absence and their neglect of the royal instructions.¹ Writing in 1724 to one colonel the then secretary at war, Henry Pelham, said he found His Majesty "every day more and more determin'd that all Officers should attend their Duty".² This was no whim of the moment but a set purpose that is evident in the letter-books of his secretary at war throughout his reign. Obviously the king's attitude had most beneficial results. At the same time it must not be imagined that the army was officered by men whose sole thought was how to escape from duty. Leave of absence was not paid, and many officers could not afford to have their pockets lightened in such gratuitous fashion.³ Moreover, a study of such of their private correspondence as has survived creates a strong impression that the army contained a good leaven of career officers who took a genuine pride in their tasks and in the regiments in which they served.⁴ Although leave of absence was

¹ For examples see P.R.O., W.O.4/22, fols. 130-31 ; W.O.4/25, fols. 47, 107, 113-14, 117. This kind of thing is to be found in all the letter-books for George I's reign, and conflicts with Fortescue's appraisal of the situation in which he speaks of "unlimited leave of absence" could an officer "bring political influence to bear" (ed. A. S. Turberville, *Johnson's England* (1933), i. 68), which seems to be rather an exaggerated estimate.

² P.R.O., W.O.4/25, fol. 120. Henry Pelham was secretary at war from 1724 to 1730.

³ Complaining about his lack of money whilst on leave from his military duty in Ireland, Captain Cuthbert Ellison said his income from the service was "next to Nothing, the Arrears [of pay] being so exceedingly ill-paid, and the Deductions from Officers that are absent so exceedingly high" (Carr-Ellison MSS., A 18, letter of 15 August 1730. See also Bagshawe MSS. 2/2/301).

⁴ Two collections which give an excellent idea of how officers worked and thought at this time, the good and the bad, are the Bagshawe Papers already mentioned, and the letters of Colonel Charles Russell of the Foot Guards from Flanders between 1742 and 1748, which were published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission as long ago as 1900. (*Frankland-Russell-Astley, Chequers Court MSS.*) Other collections of considerable value are the Carr-Ellison Papers in the Central Library, Gateshead, which include the letters of General Cuthbert Ellison (1700-85) and his brother Colonel Robert Ellison (1710-55); the *Whitefoord Papers* edited by W. Hewins published in 1898, much of which relate to Colonel Charles Whitefoord (1700-52); the second and third volumes of the papers of the Mackenzies of Suddie in the British Museum, (Add.

plentiful and, in the main, easily obtained, many of them were loath to leave their commands to the tender mercies of other people.

George had tried to deal with "purchase", parliamentary "interest", and with the prevailing indiscipline among his officers. Efficiency and uniformity were his next concern. Within a few years of his accession he introduced a system of annual inspection for all regiments at home.¹ In the summer of each year selected general officers were allocated to different districts, given a list of regiments which they were to inspect, and ordered to report, under certain headings, upon their general condition and efficiency. For the regiments the review was the highlight of the year; being the time when their training and administration during the previous twelve months were put to the test. All officers were obliged to be present, unless allowed to be absent by special certificate that was only given for properly valid reasons, and the number of men in the regiment was expected to tally with the number fixed for its establishment. Clothing, arms and equipment were inspected and reported upon, after which the regiment performed for the inspecting veteran, going through its drill movements and the various "firings", that is, the rather complicated fire-manœuvres used on the battlefields of the day.² Some inspecting officers made terse routine reports, others had more to say, much depending upon the calibre, standards, and perversity of the individual concerned. All reports went to the king himself. After the annual inspection the regiment went back to its scattered quarters, many officers and men went on leave, and the recruiting parties set out on their six month task of finding men to make good the MSS. 39,189-90), which include many letters from Lieutenant-Colonel John Mackenzie of the Marines, mostly written in the 'thirties and 'forties; and the Burrard letters in the same place (Add. MS. 34,207) which relate to Lieutenant-Colonel William Burrard (1715-70), mainly during his varied service in the West Indies, 1740-8. Many useful letters written by the military friends and correspondents of Charles, 2nd duke of Richmond (d. 1750) are to be found in *A Duke and his Friends* (2 vols. 1911) by the earl of March.

¹ Fortescue, *History*, ii. 51.

² For a description of these evolutions and an account of the development of infantry tactics in this period see Colonel E. M. Lloyd's *A History of Infantry* (1905).

expected wastage that would ensure before the next training season, the prelude to the review in late summer.¹

George I was no respecter of rank. He was more interested in the good of the army than in wounded feelings. Shortly before annual inspections were introduced he caused grave consternation among certain of his colonels by the manner in which he approved the ungentlemanly conduct of an obscure but over zealous deputy-commissary-general of musters, Gumley by name, who, in addition to satisfying himself that the numbers of the regiments he mustered tallied with their establishment, jotted down his gratuitous comments on their appearance. Gumley was careless enough to leave his muster-rolls in a hackney carriage. The coachman, on discovering them, took them to the marquis of Winchester whose name was prominent on the outer covers, being the colonel of one of the regiments concerned. Assuaging his curiosity before forwarding them to their proper destination, the marquis was overcome with anger and resentment when he found that his own regiment was described in unfavourable terms. Hot words were exchanged

¹ Reviews were taken seriously by some people. In 1752 Major John Irwin of the 5th Regiment was sent round the various quarters by his colonel to report on the progress and relative showing of other regiments at the time of the annual review. He omitted to mention neither the good nor bad points of each regiment that he saw. For example, describing the 16th Regiment he said: "The former is the largest Size Regiment except the Guards I ever saw, but they are neither Handsome nor well-looking men, their Clothing bad, ill-appointed, officers not at all au fait, salute wretchedly, and no two alike. The men exercise faster than the Horse Guards, but pretty well, they fired ill, and too slow, and marched indifferently." The following day he saw two better battalions, the 27th and the 44th, of whom he had this to say, "Both fine Battallions [*sic*]. Halkett's (44th) the greater size and rather the best dressed and best appointed. They exercised together both in exceeding good time and mighty well, they fired in general pretty well, and marched in sub-divisions, companies, etc. : very well, particularly Halkett's, but not well in Battallion. The officers of both Regiments very carefull and attentive, salute in general well, some few ill. Each Regiment had a method of their own, but each salute alike with their own Regiment." After describing five battalions with complete frankness and impartiality he concluded: "Now I have seen nothing equal to our Review, nor to the Regiment, taking one thing for another. Halkett's beats us in looks, and they are better appointed and look more uniform . . ." (*Whitefoord Papers* (1898), pp. 107-8). Government seems to have taken reviews seriously, too. There are many references to "very strict" reviews, "in every particular", here and there in the Bagshawe MSS., e.g. 2/2/7; 2/2/348, 361; 2/2/626.

between the two and his lordship tried hard to prevent Gumley from handing in his reports. Despite all efforts to stop him Gumley saw the king who was delighted with his zeal and gave him the right of direct access to the royal presence for the future. This so alarmed colonels that Gumley's later movements were well-reported by spies, in order that ample preparation could be made for the arrival of this dangerous individual whose proper duty was simply to muster, and not to inspect.¹

That a uniform system of drill movements was practised at these reviews was again due to the Hanoverians. Although a general pattern had been worked out in the years of hard campaigning under Marlborough in Flanders and under Stanhope in Spain, there was no guarantee that it would continue to be taught and practised in time of peace. No prescribed regulations were in existence, and the gradual elimination of experienced senior officers with the passage of the years would result in these hardly-won lessons being forgotten or disregarded by new colonels who were free to indulge themselves in what they did. Until George I's regulation² each colonel could determine how his regiment should be drilled and how it should execute the "firings". One or two officers of experience drew up manuals of instruction based on the successful practice of the late war,³

¹ Irwin Papers, fols. 121, 126, 130-32, 138. For a whole month the northern regiments were apprehensive about his arrival amongst them, and Irwin's major remarked in a letter to the agent, rather defensively one feels, that Gumley would find Irwin's as good as its neighbours! This was John Gumley of Gumley House, Isleworth, Middlesex. One of his daughters married William Pulteney, first earl of Bath.

² See Fortescue, *History*, ii. 51.

³ Humphrey Bland, later a general officer of dragoons, produced his *Treatise of Military Discipline* in the reign of George I, and by 1762 it had run into nine editions. General William Blakeney, famous in his old age as the defender of Minorca in 1756, seems to have written some "books of Exercise" that "were not yet put in print by him" about the end of 1716 (Irwin Papers, fol. 107). There were other guides, also produced by officers who had served under Marlborough and Stanhope in Queen Anne's wars, which appeared later. Richard Kane, colonel of the 9th Regiment, had already written his short *New System of Military Discipline for a Battalion of Foot*, but it was published posthumously in 1745; and in 1740 General Adam Williamson brought out his *Military Memoirs and Maxims of Turenne*, to which he added *Observations and Remarks* culled from his own experience. It is due largely to these officers that any detailed information on the practice of soldiering in their day has survived.

but these were only guides for the enthusiastic and not directives for the eccentric or the indolent. It was left to the monarchs to establish a pattern to which regiments should conform. Uniformity and technical precision had to precede all more imaginative developments, a fact not always appreciated by those who decry Teutonic rigidity, and George and his successors were intent upon securing them. The precision and accuracy of fire that were marked features of the British infantry in Flanders in the campaigns of the Austrian succession war are the measure of their success.¹

The sustained interest of the Hanoverian royal family in the army and its constructive efforts to improve it and protect it deserve a recognition they have seldom been accorded. To George I belongs the credit of taking the measure of a precarious situation, introducing measures to combat the disruptive forces which were at work upon his army, and, by the force of his disapproving attitude, discouraging the more subtle forces that threatened its cohesion. He was the reformer, and his son followed up his measures with equal vigour. Of the two the father was undoubtedly the more original, a trait which the grandson was to inherit, rather than the son. George II was a consolidator and not a military thinker. This did not prevent his acquiescence in the reforms of his son, the duke of Cumberland, all of which were done in his name although the credit for them was entirely the duke's. His military outlook is exposed in the letter-books of his secretary at war,² who took his commands

¹ Curiously enough, the firepower that won the day at Dettingen was not that of "Hyde Park discipline", as Colonel Russell styled the manner of the regulation practice by platoons, but by irregular rolling fire. He described the British foot as "behaving like heroes . . ." and has this to say of their method: "The whole three ranks made a running fire of their own accord, and at the same time with great judgment and skill, stooping all as low as they could, making almost every ball take place . . . almost kneeling down by whole ranks . . . but for ten or twelve minutes 'twas doubtful which should succeed, as they overpowered us so much, and the bravery of their mason du roy coming upon us eight or nine ranks deep; yet our troops were not seen to retreat, but to bend back only, I mean our foot, and that only whilst they fresh loaded; then of their own accord marched boldly up to 'em, gave 'em such a smash with loud huzzas every time they saw them retire, that then they were at once put to flight" (*H.M.C., Chequers Court MSS.* (1900) pp. 260, 278). This flexibility, however, presupposed an underlying measure of discipline such as had apparently been secured by the regulation.

² To be found in the Public Record Office, series War Office 4.

from the king, and in the remarks and observations of his servants, rather than in actual measures emanating from himself : but in all his actions and opinions George showed himself to be his father's faithful disciple. They pursued the same end and used the same means. Like his father he disliked purchase and the operation of parliamentary " interest ", had a strong concern for the poorer and more obscure among his officers, particularly if they were deserving men, and took a keen and critical interest in all things military.¹ He was unwavering in his opinions in all these matters, even though it was not always that he got his own way. He had a close connection with the army for almost half a century dating from the time he became prince of Wales. The Irwin Papers show him deputising for his father during the latter's visit to Hanover in 1716, so that the duties of a royal commander-in-chief must have been well known to him long before he succeeded his father as king.² He must have been well-acquainted with the names and faces of a great many of the

¹ For example of his attitude see W.O.4/46, fol. 338 and elsewhere ; Bagshawe MSS. 2/2/317 ; *Chequers Court MSS.*, pp. 333, 275 and elsewhere. Colonel James St. Clair of the Third Guards has this to say about one of the first reviews George II made as king. To Duncan Forbes of Culloden he wrote : " At our shew in Hyde Park from the King to the Cobler we had the applause and really deserved it in all the operations of the day but the last, which was our Firings, and in which the Second Regiment (i.e. of Guards) certainly outdid us, much contrary to their owne expectation . . . the encouragement the King gave me, who said severall most gracious things to me, amongst others that he knew we did our bussiness much better than the other two. Sir Charles [Wills, colonel of the First Guards] got severall rubs, the King not being able to stifle his anger although he endeavoured it " (*Culloden Papers*, ed. D. Warrand, iii, 23). His zeal extended to his pocket. In November 1716 a correspondent wrote from town to Lord Fermanagh : " The second Regiment [and] the Sco[ts] Regiment of Guards exercised yesterday in High Park, the Prince layed five hundred pounds with General Tatton that the Sco. Regiment performed best but lost, the Wager was decided by the Gen. officer in Town " (M.M., Lady Verney, *Verney Letters of the Eighteenth Century* (1930), ii. 33). He carried his interest in military affairs to the extent of favouring individual regiments. In 1739 Cuthbert Ellison of Hebburn was appointed lieutenant-colonel of the 23rd Regiment, the Welsh Fusiliers. This, he told his brother Henry, was " a favourite Corps of the King's . . . which he does the Honour of calling his Own ". (General John Huske, its colonel from 1743 to 1761, was a particular favourite of the old King). Carr-Ellison Papers, Bundle A 19, letters of 25 Dec. 1739 and 30 Dec. 1740.

² Irwin Papers, fols. 65, 66, 67. Concerning officers, wrote Richard Worthington to Lord Irwin, " the Prince hath a very good memory " (fol. 66).

officers of his small army. Nearly all promotions had to be approved by him in person and he made a great number of reviews, besides which he had been in constant contact with his troops in the Dettingen campaign in which he led them in person.

His favourite son, William Augustus, duke of Cumberland, known familiarly throughout the army as "the duke" was the most closely connected of the three with the internal functioning of the army. In March 1745, just before his twenty-fourth birthday, he became captain-general of the army, and for the next twelve years exercised supreme control over it, subject only to the desires and dictates of his ageing father who, on most things, was content to approve his son's decisions and accept most of his recommendations.¹ William's whole life had been closely connected with the army and at the time of his appointment he was already an experienced soldier. He had campaigned in Flanders and Germany and had been wounded in the leg at Dettingen.² Further experience was to bring great respect, esteem and affection. A few months after he took up his responsibilities he won golden opinions for his leadership at the particularly fierce battle of Fontenoy,³ and the following year he was responsible for the defeat of the Highlanders at Culloden and the suppression of the rebellion in Scotland. He was to go again to Flanders for the campaign of 1747 in which he commanded the British contingent and reinforced his reputation by his conduct

¹ The duke did not act as though his father's approval was axiomatic. See S. Pargellis, *Military Affairs in North America 1748-65* (1936), pp. 398-9, for instances of his caution in this respect.

² The duke acted with his usual personal bravery at Dettingen, which delighted his royal father. "William, I'm glad you behaved so well, you acted like my son," said the latter, "if you do well, I shall not be sorry for your wound." In one of his letters home at this time Colonel Russell wrote to say that the duke was "thought to be in some danger, his wound being attended with a fever, and his body being gross makes it go but ill with him; his Papa, they say, was in tears for him yesterday morning . . ." (*Chequers Court MSS.*, pp. 259, 263).

³ Captain Joseph Yorke of the Guards wrote of him: "I never saw or heard of such behaviour as the Duke's: he rode everywhere, he encouraged the wavering, he complimented the bold, he threatened the cowards. . . . Had the nation seen him they would have adored him" (P. C. Yorke, *Life of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke* (3 vols., 1913), vol. i. pp. 392-3).

at the hard fought action of Laffeldt.¹ His popularity in the army, particular with the junior officers and the men was enormous. After Culloden his troops shouted as he came down the line "Huzzah, now Billy, for Flanders!", a hint for him to take them over to the continent once more, to even scores with the French. He was equally popular with their dashing young officers, and his prestige was very high.² This is something over which the epithet "Butcher Cumberland" has cast a dark shadow that has obscured the force of his courage and ability and the more important side of his work.

The duke was responsible for the extension and consolidation of his grandfather's schemes of reform. He laid down a pattern of exercises for drill and the "firings" and demanded a fixed attention to them that permitted no deviation.³ He introduced

¹ For an account of his personal conduct in the thick of the fight see Russell in *Chequers Court MSS.*, p. 372.

² When the duke left the expeditionary force for the winter of 1746/7 he was sorely missed by many people in it. Captain Richard Meggott of the King's Regiment told the duke of Richmond: "You have gott our Duke once more from Us, My Lord, and I give your Grace Joy of it, with all my Heart, for I am satisfied, Nobody tastes it more, but I hope, Wee only lend him you till Spring, for, for my own part, and I am sure, at ye same time, I speak ye Sentiments of the Whole Army, Wee shall eternally regret him, when he is from Us, and tis with Some Concern that I add (but for all that I firmly believe it true) that Our Fellows will never fight, with so much Coolness and firmness, as under his Eye and Command" (Lord March, *A Duke and his Friends* (1911), ii. 526). When he took up command of the forces in Scotland before Culloden many regretted that he had not been sooner appointed. "Had he been at Falkirk", wrote an officer of the 10th Dragoons, "those brave Englishmen that are now in their graves had not been lost, his presence doing more than six thousand men. . . ." See article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, which does full justice to his courage, is fair about his qualities as a general, but pays no attention at all to his military reforms which were undoubtedly his greatest contribution to the good of the army.

³ In 1757 Sir John Mordaunt who was to command the troops on an amphibious operation against the French coast exercised his regiments in a more flexible manner than that laid down by regulation. When he heard of this the duke was furious and wrote to Barrington, the secretary at war: "I must desire that you will acquaint Sir John Ligonier, for the Army in general; and to all General Officers commanding Corps, Sir John Mordaunt not excepted, that I am Surprised to hear that my orders as to Firing and Posting of the officers, approved and confirmed by His Majesty, are changed according to the Whim and Supposed Improvements of every fertile Genius; and that therefore, it is my positive order, that in the Forming and Telling off of Battalions, they conform exactly to those Standing orders, which they have all received; and that no one presume to

a set of standing orders governing the routine and conduct of cavalry and infantry that were the fruit of his own extensive experience in Flanders and Scotland.¹ An attention to the outward signs of uniformity accompanied these measures, and were but part of a general scheme of reform although they have attracted separate notice and are therefore better known.² The duke paid great attention to the promotion of efficient and deserving officers and gathered round himself a body of competent and clever men whose social background might not otherwise have made them eligible for the rank and position to which their merit elevated them under his careful eye,³ while the headquarters

introduce new Schemes, without their having been approved by His Majesty, or by my orders." See Pargellis, *op. cit.* p. 398. However, not everyone shared this view. Charles, third duke of Richmond, an enthusiastic soldier who was then Lieutenant-colonel of the 33rd Regiment, thought that Mordaunt was in the right and he admired his courage in carrying out schemes which he deemed essential to the success of the expedition in the face of the duke's certain displeasure. See *H.M.C., Bathurst MSS.* (1923), pp. 679-81.

¹ See the *Journal for Army Historical Research* for a reprint of these orders. Selections from the duke's order books in Scotland and Flanders were reprinted in Campbell MacLauchlan's life of Cumberland (1876), mainly for the years 1745 to 1747, with biographical notes. Several order books for the campaigns in Flanders 1742-8 have survived. There is one, by an unknown hand, in Chetham's Library, Manchester, and several of John, 20th Earl of Crawford, who served as a lieutenant-general there have recently been deposited in The John Rylands Library. Others very probably, still exist. A printed copy of Cumberland's "Rules and Articles for the Better Government of His Majesty's Horse and Foot Guards and all Other of his Forces" (1749), which deals with a variety of subjects, under headings, is deposited with the Bagshawe Muniments, B 5/3/5.

² His concern with dress and the outward semblance of military regularity led Horace Walpole to state, rather unfairly, that he was "as intent on the establishing the form of spatter-dashes and cockades as on taking a town or securing an advantageous position" (quoted by Basil Williams, *The Whig Supremacy 1714-60*, p. 207).

³ Among their number was Robert Napier, adjutant-general of the army for many years, Studholme Hodgson who performed the considerable feat of capturing Belleisle in 1761 and lived long enough to become a field-marshal when that rank was reintroduced in 1793, David Watson, a little known Scot who became Quarter-Master-General, and William Strode, who erected a statue to his old master in Cavendish Square in 1770. These were all men of obscure origin whose ability and personality had caught the duke's eye, and without his patronage it is doubtful whether they would have got as far as they did. Napier came from the Scottish merchant class, one of his uncles being sometime provost of Stirling (*Burke's Landed Gentry* (1906 edn.), i. 318). Cumberland got the 11th regiment for him in 1757 (Calcraft Letter Book, vol. i., fol. 106; B.M. Add. MS. 17,493).

staff of the army was probably more efficient and worked more to a system and set policy than it did at any time previous to his term of office.¹ In this he was aided by an intelligent secretary at war in the person of Henry Fox who worked in close co-operation with the duke for over a decade.² It is rather appropriate that the present Horse Guards building dates from the duke's day (1751).

Cumberland was undoubtedly a man who cared a great deal for the army and took his military duties very seriously, and if he tended towards teutonic rigidity, as even his contemporaries insinuated,³ it was at least by no means without good results and should not be deplored without taking into consideration the shortcomings of the army of his day, whose indiscipline when in incompetent hands was a constant threat to efficiency.⁴ He was

¹ To take a small example, the business of demanding returns had long been established, but it was under Cumberland's supervision that Robert Napier devised and introduced printed forms which systematised the information required instead of leaving it to the vagaries of regimental adjutants (Bagshawe MSS. 2/2/440).

² The co-operation of Fox and Cumberland in the selection of officers and the work of reform has never been properly investigated, and might well be the subject of a profitable detailed study. For an instance of co-operation in marking down good officers see *H.M.C., Rutland MSS. II*, in 12th Report, part v (1889), 197, for the recommendation of Lieutenant-colonel John Stanwix who later became a lieutenant-general and colonel of the 8th Regiment.

³ "So outrageously and shockingly military", as Colonel Russell described him in 1743, although biased on this occasion since the duke had just refused him leave to go to England. It would appear that regimental officers who had to endure the proximity of the duke were not so enthusiastic about him as were officers in the army at large. When the duke received his wound Russell wrote, "We are in hopes, as he has now seen some service, and what a farce there is in so much high (Hyde) park discipline, that he will in some measure have a contempt for the superfluous part of the latter, and must own that we are not very sorry for his having lately been tied by the leg, as he is now likely to do well again, since it has been some relief to us." His Royal Highness was at this time Colonel of Russell's regiment (*Chequers Court MSS.* pp. 265-6, 299).

⁴ There is an interesting description by John Calcraft, the army agent, of the incredible disorders of the Second Guards when they marched from London to embark for Germany in 1760. "Hogarth's March to Finchley was nothing to the Scene of that Day, All Drunk, no Kind of Order and more Men of the Mob and Women than Soldiers in the Ranks, but if You name your Author they'll cut my throat, tho' this Opinion is universal and Mr. P[itt] happen'd to be on his Road to Town and see all" (Letter book, B.M., Add. MS. 17,495, fol. 144). George II had a low opinion of British discipline (*Chequers Court MSS.*, p. 260).

responsible for elevating the morale of the army and improving its order and efficiency at a time when both tasks were necessary, and his contribution to the victories of the Seven Years' War was not insignificant. He was the architect of victory, though the task of achieving it was carried through by other hands. The army was the poorer when in the autumn of 1757 he was dismissed from his post after he had concluded the Klosterzeven capitulation, following his defeat by the French at Hastenbeck.¹

A system of control so personal in its direction was bound to reflect the personality on the monarch and to be affected by it and therein lay weakness as well as strength, since the early Hanoverian princes were obstinate, prejudiced and passionate men.² Their personality affected their principles and they were, in consequence, neither partial nor impartial in their dealings, showing an excess of neither one quality nor the other. The army at large was the beneficiary of their immediate control, but individuals were apt to suffer from their foibles and prejudices. George II in particular was possessed of certain attributes and opinions which reacted unfavourable in certain cases. It was, for instance, very difficult for officers to whom he had taken a personal dislike to rise in the service. Charles Leslie, a younger

¹ For another estimate of the Duke's position in the army see Sir William Draper's reply to Junius in the *Public Advertiser*, 17 February 1769 (printed in the *Letters of Junius*, ed. C. W. Everett, London, 1927). Draper was the conqueror of Manila and a thoroughly competent and experienced military officer. "Junius repeats the complaints of the army against parliamentary influence. I love the army too well, not to wish that such influence was less. Let Junius point out the time when it has not prevailed. It was of the least force in the time of that great man, the late Duke of Cumberland, who, as a prince of the blood, was able as well as willing to stem a torrent which would have overborne any private subject. In time of war this influence is small. In peace, when discontent and friction have the surest means to operate, especially in this country, and when from a scarcity of public spirit, the wheels of government are rarely moved, but by the power and force of obligations, its weight is always too great". This is at once an indication of the power of "influence" and a good illustration of Cumberland's mental weight and firm intent. For all that he was a Cumberland protégé, Draper's public tribute rings true.

² The duke of Cumberland shared the family failings. Lord Waldegrave described him as a man of "strong parts, great military ability, undoubted courage" but with a judgement "too much guided by his passions which are often violent and ungovernable." On the other hand his lordship conceded that the duke's "notions of honour and generosity are worthy of a prince".

brother of the tenth earl of Rothes, found his promotion blocked because of his adherence to Frederick, prince of Wales. He had been in the Third Regiment of Foot Guards since 1716, and twenty years later was still a captain. He then served in the campaigns in Flanders for three years as an aide-de-camp to Lord Stair, the British commander, in 1742-44. The king must have had an intense dislike for him, since even Stair was unable to do anything for him, as one of Duncan Forbes of Culloden's correspondents narrated.

My Lo Stair gott all the commissions he ask'd, except Cha. Leslie's, which the K. refused to sign. As the Earle would not trust the ministrie's report, he applyed himself to the K. and received four No's before he left him. The commission not being given away, Charles still remains in London upon his aid-du-camp's pay, expecting better times, which cannot readily happen in this reign.¹

Charles went into the service of the Estates of Holland the following year, "being disgusted with the service of his country" and "by no means to win his bread, but promotion and rank"². Then, too, George had a fixed resolution that no officer who had ever drawn sword against his royal house should ever attain a rank of any consequence. James, fifth earl of Balcarres served thirty years in the Scots Greys and did not succeed in getting beyond the rank of captain. He had been "out" in the Fifteen with his father and this, despite a pardon, prejudiced his chances. After he had distinguished himself in action at Dettingen his name was mentioned to the king who "fell into a passion and told the minister that he had occasion to know before, that no person who had ever drawn his sword in the Stuart cause should ever rise to command, and that it was best to tell Lord Balcarres so at once", which being the case someone should have done a good deal earlier.³ In a sense, this prejudice

¹ Ed. D. Warrand, *More Culloden Papers*, iii. 232.

² For the background to this story see J. Ferguson, *The Scots Brigade in Holland* (3 vols., 1899-1901), ii. 451-3.

³ A. W. C. Lindsay, *Lives of the Lindsays* (1840 edn.), ii. 140. Lord Balcarres, despite his early errors, had a genuine regard for the service and thought having to leave it "a hard choice" but, he wrote "as our family has hitherto produced none but men of worth and honour, I can no longer bear being treated as if I were without either, and drudge on a captain, after having been thirty-seven years an officer [he had served in the navy before 1714] and lived in peace and war without reproach" (*ibid.* pp. 122, 132).

was only natural, but it extended to mar the chances of those Scotsmen who, though not involved in person, belonged to families whose members bore the Jacobite taint. Lord Balcarres' brother Alexander, the fourth earl, remained a captain in the Third Guards after twenty-nine years unblemished service because of the family allegiance.¹

George was supremely obstinate, and in matters on which he had definite views tended to have what Henry Legge styled "a dead refusal, which can never be got over", though it sometimes was.² His obstinacy had many loopholes. It extended in another direction. Though reasonably impartial in his management of promotions and appointments, he had a weakness for his Hanoverian subjects which was demonstrated during his campaign on the Rhine in 1743, on which he showed himself excessively "national". He upset his English subjects very thoroughly by a partiality for his Hanoverian troops and officers that he was at no pains to hide. "In short", wrote Colonel Russell, "so impolitic a head was scarce ever known, and his treatment of the people of the island almost insupportable, scarce lending an ear to any other advice or counsel but his own natives. . . . It is a great misfortune that our Captain shows such partiality to his

¹ Scottish officers were fully alive to this peril. Major James Murray, later Wolfe's brigadier at Quebec in 1759, was anxious about the consequence of his family's connection with the Jacobite cause and told his father-in-law, who was a political ally of the duke of Newcastle, that he was "likely to have the whole punishment of it unless protected by your influence" (R. H. Mahon, *Life of General James Murray* (1921), p. 52). Despite the two risings a quarter of the officer-strength of the army throughout the period was provided by Scottish families, and many Scottish officers gained high rank. An article on the subject of Scottish Officers in the British Army, 1714-63, appears in the current number of the *Scottish Historical Review*.

² James Oswald, *Life and Memorials of James Oswald of Dunnikier* (1825), p. 394. This particular instance was in connection with giving regimental surgeons combatant commissions and allowing them to change over to regimental soldiering, thus renouncing their profession. Despite his strong feelings on the subject several instances of this change can be cited. The same is true, to a much greater degree, over giving cavalry troop quarter-masters commissions, a common road to advancement for young men of slender means. George II is stated (*Chequers Court MSS.*, p. 275) to have been much averse to this, but a great many commissions were gained in this way during his reign. See the MS. Army Lists compiled by Mr. A. S. White, the War Office Librarian, which are kept in the Library.

own people, which our men of spirit never bear."¹ George seems to have followed his inclinations rather than his discretion in most things. His conduct during this brief excursion appears to underline the value of the clauses of the act of succession by which his father and his natural successors had been prohibited from appointing Hanoverians to posts in the army and elsewhere.

These personal prejudices, however distressing they may have been to individuals, had little effect upon the army itself which benefited greatly from the royal interest, with its essentially continental standards of soldiering, a profession which has, by tradition, ever been taken more seriously there than in England. To what extent their work, that of George I in particular, was influenced by the organization and administration of their Hanoverian army, and by continental military practice in general, is difficult to determine in default of adequate evidence²; but it is almost certain that, being the keen soldier he was, George I must have been influenced by the precepts and routine in which he had been trained since childhood. His experience of troops had extended for forty years before he became King of England, ranging from the Hungarian operations of 1675 to the command of the imperial army on the upper Rhine in 1707-9, and he had taken a part in actions as famous as John Sobieski's relief of Vienna in 1683 and William III's battle at Neerwinden in 1693. He was a thoroughly experienced soldier, far more so than his son, whose active service had been confined to the Oudenarde campaign of 1708.³

¹ *Chequers Court MSS.*, pp. 259-60. Besides deprecating the value of his troops, George gave much offence to those officers engaged about his person by his marked preference for Hanoverians, and several of them resigned in consequence of the snubs they received (p. 260). There is an excellent account of George's daily routine during his service in the field on p. 273. This conduct finally resulted in Lord Stair, the British field commander, tendering his resignation, because, wrote Russell "he has for some time past thought himself extremely ill-used; greatly neglected, seldom consulted, and when so, his schemes rejected and disapproved of" (p. 284).

² L. von Sichert's *Geschichte der Königlich-Hannoverschen Armee*, 3 vols., 1870, is of little use for anything but the campaigns in which the Hanoverian regiments were engaged. No more recent history of use in this connection seems to have been compiled, and it would be necessary to consult manuscript material to establish the precise administration and regulation of the army in 1714.

³ See the article in the *D.N.B.*, which pays no attention to his military reforms when king of England.

There can be no doubt that the Hanoverians made a considerable effort to improve their army, both by their positive measures of reform and by the attitude they adopted towards the forces which were undermining its morale and its efficiency. Against the measure of their achievement, their rigidity of ideas, their worship of discipline for its own sake, and their foibles of personality would seem to be of lesser concern ; discipline and uniformity, the two attributes for which they have been pilloried, being, in truth, the very qualities which were most sadly lacking in the army of the day. It would be claiming too much to suggest that their efforts were always systematic, ever continuous or entirely successful ; but at the same time it should be conceded that the disciplined forces commanded by competent officers which were encountered by Britain's enemies in many theatres of operations in the Seven Years' War owed something of their internal homogeneity and their success in battle to the reforms and example of the early Hanoverian princes.

SOME ENGLISH DOCUMENTS ON THE END OF WALLENSTEIN

By ALBERT E. J. HOLLAENDER, Ph.D., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S.

THE fall of the imperial generalissimo Albrecht Eusebius Wenzel Wallenstein, Duke of Friedland and Mecklenburgh and Prince of Glogau and Sagan, from the vertex of unparalleled power, and his violent death at Eger in the early hours of the night of 25 February 1634, represent not merely one of the most incisive events of the Thirty Years' War. They are one of the *causes célèbres* in European history. The great strategist, the ingenious and merciless economic planner, the warrior whose maxim it was that war had to feed, and to pay for, itself, the adventurer who, in the words of a contemporary, not altogether favourable, account of French origin "from a private gentleman . . . had bin advanced to supream charge, such as formerly had not binn conferred on any other", who had "of a subiect become a soveraigne",¹ fell and ended as a traitor to his lord the Emperor and his cause.

Wallenstein's treason is today an indubitable and generally unquestioned historical fact. His defection from the Emperor Ferdinand II, for whose weak, ever-hesitant and bigotted attitude he felt nothing but contempt and whose closest friend and German ally Duke Maximilian of Bavaria he openly hated, is irrefutably proven by his continued negotiations with the enemies

¹ P(ublic) R(ecord) O(ffice), S(tate) P(apers) Foreign, Germany (Empire), 80/238. The account in question is a small quarto pamphlet entitled *La vie et les maximes du Duc de Fridtlandt*, 5 (8) pp., without year and printer, filed at present with undated miscellaneous documents of the class. It is possibly the pamphlet referred to in a joint report from the two English agents in Paris Henri De Vic and René Augier to Secretary Sir John Coke, dated 7 March 1634, which relates that Wallenstein's death had now been printed and his life story (as given by the French) intended "to make him odious", S.P. France, 70/95, fol. 145^r (with Coke's endorsement). See also *infra*, p. 366, note 1. A contemporary English translation is to be found in Trinity College, Dublin, MS. G.4.8, fol. 69^r—72^v. This is given as an Appendix to this paper.

of the House of Austria : Sweden and France, Duke Johann Georg of Saxony and Duke Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar, and the Czech protestant emigrants who looked to him as their saviour after the disaster which had befallen them following the bloody suppression of their revolt in 1620. It is further proven—if indeed proof were still needed—by his two attempts to obtain from his officers written pledge of their unconditional obedience and loyalty to his person. These attempts had taken place on 12 January and 20 February, 1634 at Pilsen in West-Bohemia where Wallenstein had retreated for the winter after months of inactivity, interrupted only by one or two major—and victorious—encounters, which to the Emperor had meant not merely the loss of Regensburg but large parts of south Germany. It was the knowledge of the first of these two “Pilsener Reverses” which finally moved Ferdinand to dismiss him from his command, though the decree of his dismissal, dated 24 January, was in the first place kept secret. But less than a month later, on 18 February, the Emperor issued an order later known as the “Proskriptions-Patent”, to capture the generalissimo “dead or alive”. To ascertain the loyalty of the imperial army, Ferdinand had taken several generals who had hitherto served under the duke into his confidence : Matthias Count Gallas, friendly and kind-hearted but without imagination or humour, somewhat pedantic—an ever-obedient servant to his lord ; Johann von Aldringen (or Aldringer), a courageous and efficient field commander of unshakable honesty and faith in the imperial cause ; and Lieutenant-General Octavio Piccolomini, a native of Siena, scion of a dynasty of soldiers and scholars, an opportunist who over the years had become Wallenstein’s most perfidious and indeed most powerful adversary—and not merely in the army. These generals sounded the officer corps and succeeded in bringing the majority of them to the Emperor’s side. There is every reason to assume that Wallenstein received information of these secret investigations. As soon as the letters patent promulgating his proscription were published, he withdrew with some few reliable remnants of his forces from Pilsen to Eger. It was there that he, with four of his closest adherents, was slain by a small band of ambitious officers of his own army, before he was

able, as was certainly his intention, to join with the Swedes under Duke Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar. His immediate successor as commander-in-chief was Gallas, pending the promotion of Archduke Ferdinand, king of Bohemia and Hungary, the Emperor's ambitious son and heir presumptive, to that appointment.

This, very briefly, is the story of Wallenstein's treason and end. No serious historian of the post-Ranke generations has ever doubted his guilt.¹ His motives, however, are to this day shrouded in mystery and it is there that opinions widely differ. Heinrich von Srbik, the most advanced protagonist of the apologetic school of thought,² sees, like Schiller, Ranke and Max Lenz before him, in Wallenstein the bearer of the idea of a universal German peace founded on religious toleration throughout the Empire, a peace which after more than fifteen years of disastrous struggle had to be made, if necessary against the Emperor's will and the intentions of those with and behind him. True, Srbik argues, Wallenstein stands indicted of treason, but he had higher aims than treasonable defection from his lord for the sake of satisfying his own ambition, or worse, avarice and pathological craze for personal gain—even if he dreamed of himself as the ultimate bearer of the crown of Bohemia. Yet, even Srbik has to admit that at the time of his death Wallenstein was probably no longer capable of carrying his designs to conclusion: he was a disappointed, tired, very sick, rapidly ageing, nervous, irritable, and superstitious man, who had not only lost all faith in others but also much of his former trust in himself and certainly all his old vigour and energy. Srbik's weightiest opponent, the Czech historian Josef Pekař,³ does not

¹ For the following see the excellent summary of recent research by E. W. Zeeden in Bruno Gebhardt's *Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte*, 8th edn. (Stuttgart, 1956), ii. 149-53. For informative accounts of the facts the reader is referred to C. Veronica Wedgwood, *The Thirty Years War*, 2nd edn., in Pelican Books (No. A 397) (Harmondsworth, Middx., 1957), pp. 306 ff.; and Francis Watson, *Wallenstein—Soldier under Saturn* (London, 1938). The latter work is a forceful, yet unpolemical, though by no means uncritical narrative.

² Heinrich Ritter von Srbik, *Wallenstein's Ende. Ursachen, Verlauf und Folgen der Katastrophe*, 2nd edn. (Salzburg, 1952).

³ Josef Pekař, *Wallenstein, 1630-1634: Tragödie einer Verschwörung*. German translation of 2nd edn., 2 vols. (Berlin, 1937).

assess Wallenstein with any higher aims at all. Though he does not question his outstanding abilities as a soldier and economist, he charges him with selfishness, thirst for revenge and a complete lack of self-discipline. The Emperor's decision—which amounted with the pious monarch to a formidable *causa conscientiae*—to eliminate his rebellious generalissimo was, according to Pekař, not merely justified but a sheer necessity. The chief motives for his defection were, in Pekař's view, the duke's hatred of the Emperor and of Duke Maximilian and his ever-present wish to see himself in a more powerful position, though he did not have the format to carry out his plans—he was not endowed with such virtues as determination and judgement and he never really matched his opponents. His egotistic and hard-hearted disposition had no room for ideas such as a universal peace or indeed any patriotic feeling—all this was pretext. And yet: even such a severe judge as Pekař cannot deny that one last part of his character remains inscrutable and enigmatic.

Whatever Wallenstein may or may not have been, it is beyond any reasonable doubt that he had achieved great things in the service of his sovereign whom he despised and finally betrayed. It was Wallenstein, that strange cross-breed of condottiere and statesman, to whom Ferdinand owed the position he held in the Empire until 1630 when he dismissed his generalissimo for the first time; the secure tenure of his dominions, and not only the hereditary ones, at a time when Gustavus Adolphus had reached the zenith of his success and influence; and, last but by no means least, the army, Wallenstein's own creation, which even after its creator's sudden end remained the chief instrument of imperial policy.

One question, therefore, remains to be answered, if indeed it is answerable. Was the action against Wallenstein in the form in which it, or at least the last part of it, was taken, legally and morally justified, or justifiable? Even in an age in which *Raison d'État* had invested Authority with the power to assassinate, i.e. to "liquidate" the alleged defaulter without any interrogation or trial, an age in which there was, in a monarchical state, no room left for military adventurers and political condottieri, the method employed, or tolerated, in rendering Wallenstein "harmless"

was, to say the least, seriously questionable.¹ His end was not just a case of removing a treacherous officer from his command with subsequent sentence and execution. It was a case of premeditated wanton destruction of an important man whose merits could not be denied or belittled even in the face of his treason. Very many contemporaries guessed that. Posterity knows it.

In this paper we are not concerned with Wallenstein's tragedy as such. All we have set out to do is to try and see what information of the events at Eger reached the English Government and English politicians of the day and what impact such information had on them. It is hoped that by printing, briefly interpreting, or annotating, some few English documents relating to Wallenstein's end some little service may be rendered to English no less than continental scholars interested in the period of the Thirty Years' War.

There is reason to suppose that by October 1633, if not rather earlier, Charles I and his advisers were in possession of certain information concerning the Duke's political machinations. On 21 October, Vincenzo Gussoni, the Venetian ambassador in London, wrote to the Doge and Senate on an audience he had been given by the king in the course of which the latter mentioned a report just then circulating that Wallenstein had rebelled, but added rather cautiously that it was spread by the letters of merchants. Gussoni replied that no authentic news on the subject had reached him and intimated that the advice was "rather desirable than credible". The king agreed and added "*there are circumstances which give it some air of probability*".² What these circumstances were Charles did not say, or at least Gussoni recorded nothing about them, though we know that since June occasional scraps of intelligence had found their way to

¹ On the question of the Emperor's conscience see Hans Sturmberger, *Kaiser Ferdinand II. und das Problem des Absolutismus* (= *Österreich Archiv, Schriftenreihe des Arbeitskreises für österreichische Geschichte*, No. 2), Vienna 1957, pp. 35-37, who points out that Ferdinand, in spite of his undoubted moral objections, in the end let himself be convinced that as the supreme judge he could dispense with open judicial proceedings.

² *Cal. S.P. Ven., XXIII, 1632-1636*, ed. Allen B. Hinds (1921), p. 155 (no. 205). My italics.

him.¹ But there is in the State Papers, Germany, a document which may perhaps provide an answer. It is either a condensed agents' report or an English translation of a German news-letter—though the latter appears less likely, to judge from its form and arrangement—containing a version of the proposals for the conclusion of a future peace treaty which Wallenstein had placed before Saxony and Brandenburg either at or immediately after the first Silesian armistice at Heidersdorf and Strehlen early in June.

Of this set of "peace conditions" about whose authenticity and evidence value there used to be some doubt—some specialists were inclined to class it rather as a tendentious fabrication designed to undermine Wallenstein's authority as a commander-in-chief and his political position—two versions were hitherto known: a shorter one drawn up for secret transmission to Duke Maximilian; and a longer, more detailed one drafted in utmost secrecy for the Emperor's information. Whichever version is the more authentic, the essence at any rate, of such a document can no longer be rejected as either an entire falsification or a wicked insinuation.² And what matters most is the fact that it was the tenor of these proposals that gave the existing rift between Emperor and Generalissimo its finality.

As the English version differs to some degree from the two known ones it is given here in full.³

Pointcs propounded by Generall
Wallenstein.

1. To let the exercise of Religion free.—
2. To help them⁴ to root out the Jesuites of the Roman Empire.

¹ Ibid. p. 112 ff. (no. 161), and p. 128 (no. 178). See also the letter from Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia to Sir Thomas Roe, lately ambassador to Sweden, then living in semi-retirement in England, dated The Hague, 10 October, about "tales of Wallenstein's changing"; and the letter from Sir Edward Nicholas, then secretary to the Admiralty commissioners, to Captain John Pennington, gentleman of the Privy Chamber, dated Westminster, 10 October, who writes that Wallenstein had revolted from the Emperor and that some said that the Duke of Bavaria was dead. *Cal. S.P. Dom., 1633-1634* (1863), p. 241 (no. 55), and p. 242 (no. 59).

² Moriz Ritter, "Der Untergang Wallensteins", *Historische Zeitschrift*, xcvi (1906), 271 ff. and 295 ff.; Pekař, loc. cit. i. 311-16, and ii. 130-2; Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 73 ff. and 347 (notes).

³ P.R.O., S.P. 80/9, fol. 6r. In the following transcript all contractions are extended. Capitals are kept.

⁴ i.e. the protestant allies.

3. To restore all the exil'd Bohemish Lords.
4. To give satis-faction to His Highnes the Heyre of Frederic late Prince Elector Palatine in all things.¹
5. Contrarywise He demands for His charges the Kingdom of Bohemia & ye Marquisat of Meern² therby to command Meckelenburg & quitt Glocaw.³
6. He graunteth that ye Electors of Sax : & Brandenburg for the charges they have ben at, may retayne⁴ & possesse the wholle Silesia.
7. To content the Suedish Army, they may hold Bavaria & pay themselves.
8. For the more security he knowes noe better caution then that they should elect & crowne a King of ye Romans.—
9. At this present the newes is come that the places of Richebach are surrendered to Wallensteyn & he has forsaken Citaw.⁵

In Leipsigh, 25 June 1633.

During the months following October very little is to be found in the State Papers about Wallenstein's movements—apart from some scanty remarks on his retiring out of Silesia towards Austria⁶—and political activities; nothing about his negotiations with Sweden and the German Protestant powers, especially his vicissitudinous contacts with Fieldmarshal Hans Georg Arnim von Boitzenburg, the commander-in-chief of the army of Saxony, who had been his intermediary in his negotiations with Gustavus Adolphus—a political tactician of great talent, a steadfast protestant, yet loyal to the Empire and no personal enemy of Ferdinand. We learn nothing about the storm gathering in Vienna against the generalissimo, nothing about the story of his dismissal and proscription. When next we hear of Wallenstein the catastrophe had happened.

¹ Elizabeth, widow of Frederic V, the Elector Palatine, and former Queen of Bohemia had in 1633 levied a small army on behalf of her eldest surviving son Karl-Ludwig to whom part of the Palatinate was later restored by the peace of Westphalia.

² = Mähren, Moravia.

³ = Glogau.

⁴ Between "retayne" and "&" one word deleted.

⁵ Zittau, south-east Saxony (district of Dresden-Bautzen) suffered heavily in the course of the war. In June 1633 it was taken by the Protestant troops and Wallenstein withdrew to the nearby Reichenbach. His state of health at that time is alluded to in a letter from Heinrich Mathias Count Thurn, Czech emigrant, to the Swedish Chancellor Axel Count Oxenstierna, dated Schweiniz, 7 July, in which he says that the duke was carried to Reichenbach in a sedan chair. Georg Irmer, *Die Verhandlungen Schwedens und seiner Verbündeten mit Wallenstein und dem Kaiser von 1631 bis 1634* = *Publicationen aus den K. Preussischen Staatsarchiven*, 39, pt. ii (1889), no. 208, p. 254.

⁶ *Cal. S.P. Dom., 1633-1634*, p. 329 (no. 70) and p. 430 (no. 33).

It would appear that the first confirmable reports of the events at Eger did not reach London much before 9 March, information received being invariably brief, rather general and somewhat blurred. In a private letter signed "J. Semple", possibly a London merchant, to John, the elder son of Secretary Sir John Coke, dated Blackfriars, 10 March, it is said that "out of Germany it hath been long spoken of how the Emperor hath been very jealous of Wallenstein. There came several letters to the Exchange yesterday that Wallenstein is slain. . . ." ¹ On 14 March, Secretary Coke wrote from Newmarket to his colleague Sir Francis Windebank in London that he need not enlarge on Wallenstein's death, reports of which he, Windebank, had surely received from all sides: what will be the effect, time will discover; this only, however, he finds considerable, that it has brought some hopes and designs of the French to a halt. ² Of interest in this communication is the brief reference to French "hopes and designs". It is known that since May 1633 Wallenstein had been in contact with France through his emigré friend and fellow-conspirator Wilhelm Count Kinsky, who acted on his behalf in Dresden. It was through Kinsky that Richelieu's envoy to Germany Isaac Manassés de Pas Marquis de Feuquières had promised Wallenstein to recognize him as King of Bohemia in return for treason to the Emperor, whose unshakable alliance with Spain was one of the main obstacles to a more vigorous pursuance of French anti-Spanish policy. Richelieu did not care whether the electors, princes, soldiers and statesmen of Germany were Catholic or Protestant, as long as he was certain to obtain their co-operation against the central power in Vienna no less than against his arch-enemies in Madrid. Seen in this light, Wallenstein's hatred of the Spaniards, his wild opposition against the maintenance of a Spanish army operating in Germany under the Duke of Feria, Regent of Milan, finds some explanation. How double-faced, however, at that particular juncture, the French attitude could be, and indeed was, becomes evident from the fact that whilst on the one hand information could be

¹ *Cowper MSS.*, H.M.C., 12th Report, Appendix, part ii, vol. 2 (1888), p. 48. The heading of the extract is not strictly correct in that the recipient given as "Sir John Coke the Younger" was not knighted before 16 July 1636.

² P.R.O., S.P. 16/262, fol. 129v; *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1633-1634, p. 504 (no. 68).

disseminated in Paris and elsewhere, doubtless not without official backing, intended to make Wallenstein "odious",¹ on the other it was soon known in London that the French Court mourned for Wallenstein who had agreed "to strengthen their party".² It appears, that the duke had gone much further than to promise his support of the French cause. In December 1633 he seems to have finally accepted the offer of his recognition by the French as the bearer of the Crown of St. Wenczeslas.³

As far as can be seen from the documents, the first coherent and more detailed account of the atrocities committed at Eger came from Flanders. It is contained in a dispatch from "his Maiesties Agent at Brussels", Sir Balthazar Gerbier—that curious blend of artist and courtier (like his friend Rubens, but here the resemblance ceases), diplomat and double-agent, if not traitor, chevalier of fortune and eternal litigant, and also, and more important to us, indefatigable and prolific correspondent. He was a man in whom Charles continued to place special trust, sending him direct orders, occasionally in contradiction to those sent through the Secretary of State, even after he had, in November

¹ See *ante* p. 358, note 1. The relevant passage in De Vic and Augier's joint dispatch of 7 March, referred to there, runs: ". . . Notre derniere depesche du 3/13 de ce mois estoit accompagnée d'une relation que l'on avoit faite imprimer icy touchant la revolte de Wallestein d'ou depuis l'on a fait mettre sous la presse celle de sa mort en la forme cyointe, et l'on est a la veille de faire publier les passages de sa vie et de ses actions le plus odieuses pour faire accroire que cet accident sans ressource est arrivé par sa propre faute, et que d'icy l'on n'avoit point contribué a ce sien estoignement du service qu'il debuait a son Maistre. Le dit accident estonne pourtant ces gens-cy et dans la recontre d'iceluy ils s'assemblent journellement pour des nouvelles resolutions. . . ." The beginning of Coke's endorsement, dated Newmarket, 21 March, reads thus: "Wallenstein's death printed. The storie of the life intended to make him odious, therefore take of all opinion of the french treatie with him. His death puts the french to new resolutions. . . ." The day before, De Vic had written to Coke, "Your Lo:pp will have had the newes of Wallensteins death. I sende you herewith the particulars of it as they have been published here where these men have not been a little surprised with this accident, for the greate hopes they had conceived of his defection from the Emperor whereof they had received the newes by an express a few dayes before. . . ." P.R.O., S.P. 78/95, fol. 143^r.

² P.R.O., S.P. 16/263, fol. 43^v, and *Cal. S.P. Dom., 1633-1634*, p. 517 (no. 17), John Durie, the Protestant divine, to Sir Thomas Roe, Westminster, 19 March 1634. Durie adds: ". . . They (the French) are like to breake quite with the Swedish." This is an assumption for which no corroborative evidence can be found in the documents.

³ Wedgwood, *loc. cit.* p. 313.

1633, betrayed to the Infanta Isabella for the sum of twenty-thousand crowns the king's secret negotiations with the mal-content nobles of the Spanish Netherlands. Whether Charles ever became aware of the treason or not would have made no difference—Gerbier was and remained his particular favourite because he had been a favourite with Buckingham.¹ So much for an estimate of the king's confidant, who speaks for himself in the paragraphs which follow. What cannot be denied is that he was the centre of an extensive information service.² It is for that reason that his dispatches are worth reading, though in his evaluation of the information received he displays an appreciable degree of credulity.

Gerbier's dispatch is dated Brussels, 7/17 March, and was received by Sir John Coke according to his own endorsement on 17 March "our style". Its text, as far as it relates to Wallenstein is as follows : ³

This weeke hath filled all mens mouthes here with the newes of ye Duke of Fritlands death which the Nuremberg and Saltzburg letters mention ; the said Duke (as said) become traitor to the Emperour, marching with sixteen regiments towards Egra, the place appointed to meete parties, and from thence to pursue his designes ; to have there ben murdered the 25/15 past with such of his company as were at supper with him, don by the governour of that towne, who used an Irish captayne to give the first blow to Fritland, some write it was with a sable, others a pertuisane, that this tragedy was acted by 25 men who spared not fower pages which served at ye table : the dead bodies were throwne on dung carts and carried about ye streets. Some letters beare the governour of the towne of Egra received the Emperours order to seize on Fritland but two howers before his arrivall there ; that the said Duke entred into the towne, but with two compaignies of his gard. Its wondred here he ventured himselfe so in his

¹ Samuel H. Gardiner, *History of England from the accession of James I to the outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*, new edn. (London, 1899), vii. 345 ff. It may be added here that Gerbier never stood in high esteem with the Spaniards. Captain Richard Plumleigh, apparently on hearing of Gerbier's departure for Flanders—he sailed with his family on 17 June 1631—wrote from The Downs on 22 June to Secretary Nicholas, "Mr [sic] Gerbier is not well treated by the Spaniards who slight him much". *Cal. S.P. Dom., 1631-1633*, p. 85 (no. 46).

² In the account dated 4 May 1632, of fees probably paid at the Exchequer on the issue of certain sums principally to persons on foreign service between 16 December 1631 and 3 May 1632, Gerbier is shown as having received £786, being the fourth highest payee on the roll. *Cal. S.P. Dom., 1631-1633*, p. 324 (no. 19).

³ P.R.O., S.P. 77/24/i, fol. 99^r-100^r (with two copies) ; and S.P. 105/10, Gerbier's Letter books (unfoliated), the last paragraph headed there as postscript.

dangerous designe ; of its discovery and the said Dukes death many joyce & many remayne in doubt if the successe will mend much the affaires of the Emperour since the confusion is said to be great in the Army, and that its thought parties will loose noe time. The towne of Pilsen, said to contayne Fritlands treasure, is thought will cause parties to venture a faire rest.

Its written Fritlands general of the horse was to act his part att Prague where he is said taken. Its given out here he was to kill the Emperour and the King of Hungary who made from Vienna towards Prague accompanied with the troupes of Gallas & Aldringer, so ye letters of the 22th past from that place mention. The confirmation of the aforesaid tragedy is expected every hower. . . .

Letters of the 6th present from Frankfort confirme the death of Fritland, that he who killed him is named Gordon. The remayner of Fritlands forces to be with Duc Bernard Weimar and therewith Egra blocqued up. Duke Albert of Saxen-Lawenburgh taken prisoner in Egra.

The above dispatch is perhaps best read in conjunction with a private letter from Gerbier to the Duchess of Buckingham, the widow of his late patron and promoter, dated 14 March.¹ He writes :

I wish my letter might be filled up with some occurences worth your Graces reading. Most here busy their tongues to discover as much of Fritlands death as before of his life, both strange and violent, for though theise latter yeares he was said to have ben more reserved, before his end he appeared to have bin taken with a relapse which could hardly free him, or any shall take the like resolution of a violent end. Its thrice confirmed the said Duke of Fritland had forsaken the Emperours party, endeavoured to make his, to joyne with the Germans in league with the Suedes, of which the Emperour being advertised sent orders to the governour of Egra, a frontier towne in Bohemia, to seice on Fritland and send him to Vienna live or dead. Between Fritland and this order seemed a great simpatheie, for each run with speede to one place to meete. Fritland made in diligence towards Egra with 16 regiments of his troupes and arrived there one hour after the gouvernour had received the said order. There Fritland purposed to meete with Duke Weimar and Arnheim, general to the Duke of Saxe. Both mistrusting Fritlands designe were as slow to advance as Fritland was hasty and undavored to seeke his death which (as is written) he mett thus. Having left his troupes about Egra, entred into the towne only with two companies of his guard, lodged in a private mans house where the gouvernour (with certaine of his companie), an Irish man, tooke the supper time to act the tragedie : kild first the count Tertzky, Collonell Illo, count Kinsky & Coll Neuman ; Fritland retired to a next roome, the doors broken, was killed with three trusts of a pertisan, two of his pages & his trompeter were also slained ; also throwne out of windowes, & trained up and downe the streets. Fritlands head is sent to Vienna & his body to Prague ; his treasure said to be a million in all, the canon and munition left in Pilsen is recovered by one of the Emperours generalls called Piccolomini.

Fritland took this resolution to fall from the Emperour upon advertisements his enemies had wrought soe far as the Emperour resolved to depose him. Its

¹ P.R.O. S.P. 105/10 (Letter book).

uncertain what change this will cause in the affaires of the Emperour who makes towards Prague with the King of Hungary and designe to appeare in person in the field.

And on 21 March Gerbier reported from Brussels to Coke : ¹

. . . These [here] have entertayned themselves much with the newes of Fritlands death of which & the treasons discovery publicke thankes have ben rendred throughout theire churches warranted thereunto by the archbishop of Meckelen (Mecheln). The treason is much enlarged, Fritlands designe said to have ben his adherents to kill Emperour, King of Hungary & the young Prince, so exterminate the house of Austria.

The Marquis d'Aytona impartinge the newes to Monsieur said Spaine had not moved the Emperour to dismisse Fritland, less to have him murthered, that the Germans unanimously fell on him & were as eager to fall from him as he from the Emperour.

Theise spare not to publish the french negotiants to have moved Fritland to his rebellion, (and) say to follow his worke many here would have sturred, soe the discovery of such evils of which the house of Austria hath ben threatned is accounted for great lucke.

No advanced scholarship is required to see that all the three foregoing communications from Gerbier represent in the main a record of stories, rumours and unconfirmed statements derived, certainly, from a variety of sources. In the first of the three documents Wallenstein and such of his faithful friends and adherents as were at supper with him were slain together, whereas it was at the time of drafting reasonably well known abroad that the Duke's four lieutenants, Adam Erdmann Count Trčka, his "general of the horse", together with General Christian Count Ilow, Count Wilhelm Kinsky and the cavalry captain Heinrich Nieman who had been in charge of Wallenstein's field orderly room, had been massacred by Colonel Walter Butler's dragoons at the infamous banquet at Eger Castle to which they had been invited by Colonel John Gordon, the commandant of the citadel and town, whilst Wallenstein had met his end a little later the same night at the Pachelbel house in the lower market place.² Further, a little more sifting of incoming evidence would, even at this early date, have prevented Gerbier

¹ P.R.O., S.P. 77/24/iii, fol. 117^r; and S.P. 105/10 (unfoliated).

² The present Town hall, called after its former owner Alexander Pachelbel, late mayor of Eger, who, as a Protestant, had emigrated after the Roman Catholic Council had his residence confiscated. The house served as Lt.-Col. Gordon's headquarters. Upon Wallenstein's arrival at Eger in the later afternoon of 24 February, Gordon moved to the Castle. Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 168 and 170.

from reporting that Trčka had been apprehended in Prague. That he repeats lurid stories about the duke's intentions to do away physically with the Dynasty—stories which almost definitely originated at the Palace in Vienna¹—that he is despite the large number of sources at his service singularly badly informed about the course of events on the night of the “execution” we will not hold against him: too much was talked and written about the event too soon.² That he makes no attempt to grasp at least

¹ See the letter from P. Guilielmo Lamormaini, S. J., the Emperor's Father confessor, to the P. General S. J., Mutio Vitelleschi, dated Vienna, 3 March, reproduced by Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 310 ff. (from a contemporary copy in the Vatican Library, Cod. Barber. Lat. 6515) which begins: “Machinationes internae Fridlandi tandem 12. Januarii in coniurationem eruperunt. Volebat ille [sc. Wallenstein] perdere imperatorem, extirpare domum Austriacum, regnis et provinciis Austriacis potiri ipse et fidelium caesaris ministrorum ditones ac dominia coniurationis sociis distribuere. . . .”

² See e.g. the (private) letter from Charles Franckland, very probably a London merchant (and almost certainly identical with the bearer of that name who was the son of Robert Franckland, of London, and died in 1662 at Guildford, Surrey, cf. *The Visitation of Surrey 1662-8*, ed. Sir George Armytage, *Harleian Society Publications*, lx (1910), 44 with facsimile of a late signature) to a friend of his, Richard Harvey, at Sir William Calley's, Burderop (Wilts.), dated St. Anne Street (Westminster ?), 20 March, the relevant passage of which runs: “. . . It is certain Walestein is murdered and Gallas hath his gouvernement. Some say one Pittalomine [sic] who Walestein imployed about the death of the Prince of Denmark did the act and was set aworke by Arnham; others that it was with the consent of the Emperour for that Walesten was revoltinge and sought to bringe in the French, but his wicked act hath caused manie of his armie to become friends to the Swedes and Gustavus Horne upon this accident is gone downe into Bohemia with 8 or 10000 brave souldiers. What the event will be time will tell. . . .” He further quotes rumours about a great fleet of French and Hollanders about Calais and a great army in Picardy, “but some English gentlemen lately come from thence say there is noe such matter”. P.R.O., S.P. 16/263, fol. 51^{r/v}. The passage referring to Piccolomini as having been “imployed about the death of the Prince of Denmark” is an allusion to the murder, on 11 August 1633, during a conference in open field, of Prince Ulrich of Denmark, Duke Holstein (son of Christian IV) who had acted as Saxon negotiator with Trčka and other emissaries of Wallenstein. There appears to be little doubt that Piccolomini had a hand in this, but that Wallenstein was a party to it is not only entirely unproven but altogether an untenable invention. Cf. *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1633-1634, pp. 211 and 241; Irmer, loc. cit. ii, no. 224, pp. 284 f; no. 227, p. 291; no. 228, p. 293; no. 267, p. 357; and no. 282, p. 385 (documents of Lars Tungal Nicolai, the Swedish resident in Dresden); also Herman Hallwich's informative article “Piccolomini” in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, xxvi (Leipzig, 1888), 100. For the above references to Charles Franckland I am indebted to Mr. Donovan A. Dawe, Principal Assistant Librarian, Guildhall Library, London.

something of the political and military background, if only, as was his duty, to brief his chief as best as he could, is a more serious fault. And yet, there are one or two redeeming features about his communications, both official and private, which prove that he had some excellent informants. That Arnim and—though perhaps to a lesser degree—also Duke Bernhard of Weimar mistrusted Wallenstein's designs and "were as slow to advance as Fritland was hasty" is, to say the least, a very sound appreciation of a state of affairs which in the weeks immediately following upon the tragedy remained obscure to all but the initiated in the Saxon camp. It may thus be surmised that Gerbier based his observations on intimations which reached him directly from those quarters, and it is to be regretted that of the very numerous private "letters" and reports directed to him and to which he occasionally refers, mostly in vague terms, virtually none has come down to us. In his dispatch of 21 March he produces, perhaps unwittingly, an altogether very correct piece of information, namely in his reference to the disclosures made by the Marquis d'Aytona to the new Regent of the Netherlands, the Cardinal Infant Ferdinand, brother of King Philip IV—the Infanta Isabella had died on 22 November 1633—"that Spaine had not moved the Emperour to dismissee Fritland lesse to have him murthered". This is perfectly true, as we now know. The official policy of the Council of State in Madrid, led by the shrewd Gaspar Guzmán Count Olivares, backed Wallenstein in his position as imperial generalissimo until as late as December 1633 if not January 1634, and not merely because they regarded him as a military genius: to the Spaniards he appeared as the only effective political counterpoise against the growing influence on the Emperor of Duke Maximilian of Bavaria whom they hated; and also because they hoped—though in vain—that Wallenstein would be moved to promote a firm alliance between the Emperor and Spain and to transfer a large contingent of his forces to the troops now under the Cardinal Infant who succeeded the Duke of Feria after the latter's death in December 1633 as commander-in-chief of the Spanish army in Germany, now destined to fight on the Upper Rhine and in Alsace. In their antagonism to France the Spaniards were even prepared to accept help from the

Protestant powers. At any rate, it is known that Olivares sharply rebuked the then Spanish ambassador to the Court of Vienna, Marquis de Castañeda, who belonged to the party of Archduke Ferdinand, King of Hungary, and was one of Wallenstein's most embittered enemies, for his relentless attitude towards, and undisguised activities against, the generalissimo. And this, despite his strategic lethargy, which was strongly resented in Madrid, even despite his violent anti-Jesuit utterances! An instruction to Castañeda of 23 January 1634 pointed out that only if treason on the part of the generalissimo could be clearly proven, and it was hardly assumed that it could, then the imperial generals should be contacted and the traitor be taken prisoner and, if unavoidably necessary, killed. However, neither Castañeda nor his colleague, the Ambassador extraordinary in Vienna Inigo Velez de Guevara Conte d'Oñate, whose previous negotiations with Wallenstein about the hoped-for alliance and formal conclusion of a defence treaty and a contingent of forces for the Cardinal Infant had produced no result whatever, proceeded strictly in accordance with their instructions. In closest association with the Palace party in Vienna, who worked assiduously towards Wallenstein's final destruction, they preferred to follow their own maxims.¹ Thus, Gerbiers information was, in this respect, absolutely correct.

In London the news of Wallenstein's end was, officially at least, treated with reserve. Whilst during the summer of 1633, at the height of the armistice negotiations between the Duke and Saxony, hopes for the protestant cause had been placed in what was generally expected to be an almost imminent "composition",² such hopes appeared now, though not altogether lost, considerably diminished. On 31 March, Vincenzo Gussoni, the Venetian ambassador, wrote from London that what was now known of the generalissimo's death had come as a great relief to all those who openly sided with the House of Austria and that they anticipated great advantage from that event to the imperial arms in the

¹ See G. Mecenseffy, "Habsburger im 17. Jahrhundert. Die Beziehungen der Höfe von Wien und Madrid während des Dreissigjährigen Krieges", *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte*, 121. Bd, Heft 1 (Vienna, 1955), pp. 21-6.

² *Cal. S.P. Ven.*, xxiii, 1632-1636, pp. 112 f. (no. 161) and p. 128 (no. 178).

future. But the wisest, so he adds, *and those of the government in particular, seem to refrain from forming an opinion*, until they can see better what results such a great change is likely to produce, *since the Lords here are advised from several quarters that outbreaks of disorder have manifested themselves very strongly in the imperial army, in spite of the fall of Wallenstein and of those commanders who depended on him.*¹ Just over a week later, on 4 April, the same diplomat, after an interview with Secretary Sir John Coke, reports to his authority that Sir John remarked that two things had astonished the King and the Lords here, one that Wallenstein had *allowed himself to be caught*, the other that his death had not, as the first advices seemed to indicate, been followed by consequences more disadvantageous to the "Imperialists" than they heard had been the case so far.² Here, it would appear, Charles shared surprise with the French, if importance is attached to the words of the French general G. J. Peblis who wrote on 31 March from Frankfurt, to James, second Marquis of Hamilton (then still in Swedish military service), that the enemy after the assassination of Wallenstein by the Scots and Irish had found means to appease their army to strengthen themselves "at which I marvel as I firmly believed that after such a tragedy a great change would follow".³

We now turn to what seems to be at least the most comprehensive document relating to Wallenstein's end contained in the

¹ *Cal. S.P. Ven.*, xxiii, 1632-1636, p. 206 (no. 276). My italics.

² *Ibid.* p. 209 (no. 281). My italics. No direct reference to "outbreaks of disorder in the imperial army" can, as far as I am able to see, be traced in the State Papers. But from Venice the English resident Sir Thomas Rowlandson writes to Coke on 4 April that news had been received of the Emperor's imminent departure to Prague, one of the purposes being "to allure ye kingdome of Bohemia from ye innovation that might araise by Wallesteins kindred and friends, for it seems ye Germaines are not well sattisfied with ye manner of the proceedings against his life . . .". On the same day he reports to the Lord Treasurer: ". . . It seems that Wallesteins kindred and friends that are verye potent in ye kingdome should attempt some innovation there which may easily be prevented by the Emperours presence. . . ." P.R.O., S.P. 99/34, ii, fol. 188^r and 189^r. That the Emperor, advised by Gallas, planned to visit his forces at Budweis, obviously to inspire the rank and file by his personal presence, is known. Rumours of mutinies and bloodshed which persisted especially in Nuremberg and Regensburg were, at any rate, gross exaggerations. Srbik, *loc. cit.* pp. 202 and 401.

³ *Hamilton MSS.*, H.M.C., 11th Report, Appendix 6, pt. vii, p. 88.

State Papers. Only its publication can show whether it is what it purports to be. It is a relation "*exhibited*", as is stated in its heading, "*at Vienna to his Imperial Ma^{ty} in . . . 1634 by Capitaine Denis M^{ac}Donnell, Irish, of the regim^t of Colonell Buttler . . .*" and consists of two folio paper sheets (four pages) covered by close writing.¹ Though today bound with the State Papers, it is not certain whether the document is in fact a state paper in the strict, that is to say, archival sense of the word. For, side by side with the official ink stamp of HER MAJESTY'S STATE PAPER OFFICE, there is what appears to be a private stamp CONWAY PAPERS.

The "Conway Papers", or better "Conway and Throckmorton Papers" are a collection of documents the main portion of which contains the papers of Edward first Viscount Conway and Killultagh who was from 1623 until 1628 one of the principal Secretaries of State, thereafter Lord President of the Council, and who died in London on 3 January 1631. After several wanderings they came eventually into the possession of John Wilson Croker, one of the Commissioners for printing and publishing State Papers. On 10 August 1857—ten days before his death—he offered them to the Home Secretary for permanent transfer to the Public Record Office. His offer was accepted and the papers reached the office on 26 August 1857 and were thereupon, as far as they related to public affairs, incorporated in the series of State Papers Domestic as well as Foreign.²

Since the first Viscount died in 1631, our document cannot

¹ P.R.O., S.P. 80/9, fol. 23^r–24^v.

² The story of the transfer is told in the *Reports of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Record Office*, xix (1858), p. 17 f., xx (1859), p. xxi, and xxii (1861), p. 54. See also Florence M. Greir-Evans (Mrs. C. S. S. Higham), *The Principal Secretary of State: A survey of the office from 1558 to 1680* (London, 1927), pp. 179 ff., 183 f. and 369 ff. For much kind help and valuable information my hearty thanks go to Dr. Neville J. Williams, Assistant Keeper at the Public Record Office. That the collection must, at some time prior to its transfer to the P.R.O. have been somewhat tampered with is shown by the fact that some strays from it, bearing the stamp CONWAY PAPERS are still—February 1958—at large: two purely domestic letters addressed to the first and second Viscount respectively by a Torrington (Devon) correspondent and dated 2 December 1629 and 5 January 1640/1 have turned up on the London autograph market. See Ifan Kyrle Fletcher (of 22 Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.1), *Autograph Letters, Manuscripts, etc.*, Catalogue no. 182, p. 28, item no. 171.

have formed part of his papers. His son and heir Edward, the second Viscount (1594-1655), was in 1624 elected M.P. for Warwick, in 1626 for Yarmouth (Isle of Wight). Soon afterwards he was appointed Privy Councillor and eventually, in 1639, Marshal of the Army and General of the Horse. Since September 1625, when Sir John Coke became Joint Secretary, he and the first Viscount had been close colleagues, and after the latter's death Sir John maintained contact with his son. We know that the second Viscount whose town house was in the Strand near the church of St. Martin in the Fields, left England soon after 14 July 1633 for Ireland,¹ to devote himself to the care of his family estates and to various pastimes, and that he did not return before the end of 1634 or the beginning of 1635.² Where, when, from whom and under what circumstances he received the document if indeed it ever reached him personally, must remain unknown. The possibility of its having found its way into the collection as an antiquarian curiosity of partly Irish interest at a later, perhaps much later, date cannot *a limine* be ruled out. So much for the the provenance of the document whose classification as a "state paper" remains questionable.

One thing, however, is certain: it is a contemporary manuscript. Written in a steady though somewhat pressed and spidery English hand, its palaeographical character points to a period definitely not later than the middle of the century. And it must have been written for some purpose. This becomes evident from an examination of its full and rather long-winded heading which is *A relation exhibited at Vieña to his Imperiall Ma^{tie} in the year of our Lord 1634 by Captaine Denis / M^{ac}Donell Irish of the regiment of Colonel Buttler / & most gratically accepted as a token of eternall / memorye of the renowned Irish nation repayer & preserver of the mangnificent howse of Austria / to eternize their their names in historyes of present & / future adges couched in Spanish by John Pinzell / de Rumeran a Biscani Spaniard borne in the Province of Guipusca.*³

¹ *Cal. S.P. Dom., 1633-1634*, p. 140 (no. 68).

² *Ibid. 1634-1635*, p. 583 (no. 6).

³ This title-copy is for reference only. The oblique strokes mark line endings. The original arrangement of the heading is given in the transcript below.

One need not have much of a historian's acumen to feel at once that this heading poses a number of problems. Who was Captain Denis MacDonell, and in what position was he to "exhibit a relation"? And when the relation had been exhibited why did it have to be "couched in Spanish"? Who was John (or Juan) Pinzell de Rumeran, a native of the smallest Spanish province of Guipúzcoa? And lastly, at whose instance was the Spanish text translated into—excellent—English? Before we can attempt to answer some of these questions—some only, because again not all of them are answerable—we must take a brief glance at a small group of documentary narratives which are perhaps best called "immediate reports", that is to say, reports written by persons who were personally participants in, and responsible for, the "execution" and its preparation though not necessarily eye-witnesses to the entire course of events; in other words—and by their use no moral judgement is passed—the reports of the accessories.¹

There is, to begin with, a draft report in the Vienna State Archives, headed *Wahrhaffte Relation all dess jenigen, was sich von dem 24. Febr biss den 28. eiusdem bey des Herzogen von Fridtlands und seiner Adhärenten Ankunfft und darauf erfolgten Execution begeben und zugetragen*. This is, as the late Heinrich von Srbik has convincingly demonstrated, most probably the work of John Gordon, the commandant of the citadel and town of Eger, and was drawn up at the latest on 28 February, before Duke Bernhard's liaison officer, Duke Franz Albrecht of Saxe-Lauenburg, captured on his way to Wallenstein, of whose death he was absolutely ignorant, was delivered at Eger. The document, originating directly at the scene of events so to speak and containing valuable details of the atrocities both at the castle and thereafter at the Pachelbel house, was on or about 1 March re-edited, by way of very extensive deletions, additions and corrections, by Piccolomini himself who, coming from Mies, had arrived at Eger on 28 February, to act as a commissary in establishing the *species facti*. He took an inventory of the movable effects of the dead, and sent their remains, together with such of their writings as were found and some of their private chattels, and last, but by no means least,

¹ For the following see the masterly analysis by Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 145-59.

Wallenstein's field treasury as well as the captured Duke of Lauenburg, to Gallas at his Pilsen headquarters. It is more than likely that he submitted the draft of the relation to Gallas whom he joined for a short conference before setting off in haste for Vienna on 6 March to report to the Emperor.¹

The next document in this group is a rather brief account by the "Oberst-Wachtmeister" (Colonel-Sergeant-Major²) of the Trčka regiment Walter Leslie (later Count Leslie) of Balquhain,³ who reports in the name of the three leaders of the action against Wallenstein, namely Butler, Gordon and himself. His narrative gives, as regards the actual liquidation of the generalissimo and his adherents, hardly more than the bare facts, but is of great importance as setting forth the motives of the "loyal" officers for their final resolution to do away with the rebels. More particularly, it reproduces in some detail a conversation between himself and Wallenstein on the latter's march to Eger on 24 February when the Duke disclosed that he had decided on being his own master, of which he was fully capable in every respect, should the Emperor no longer require his service. It goes on to describe Ilow's attempt on the morning of the following day, 25 February, to win them over to Wallenstein's side, and their reaction to it.⁴ Leslie had been ordered by Butler on 27 March to go to Vienna to deliver his report in person to the Emperor. He went first to Pilsen to present himself to Gallas, the commander-in-chief, who directed him on to Vienna where he arrived in the evening of 3 March, thus preceding Piccolomini by three days.

At the same time, however, yet another "loyal" officer was fast approaching the capital. This time it was Butler's personal and special envoy: an Irish captain serving with his dragoons, hitherto known by the name of Dionysius Macdaniel. He is beyond any doubt identical with our Captain Denis MacDonell.⁵

¹ Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 149 f.; text, edited critically, *ibid.* pp. 313-16.

² Lieutenant-Colonel of Cavalry.

³ About him Herman Hallwich in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Bd. 18, (1883), pp. 437-77, and J. M. Rigg in *D.N.B.*, xi (1909), pp. 988 f.

⁴ Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 151 f., and text (after a copy by an unknown hand in the Vienna State Archives) *ibid.* pp. 317-21.

⁵ In the *Relationsbericht so des Wallensteinischen und seiner anhangen tod's verlauf, so den 24 Februarii a. 1634 sich zu Eger verlossen*, printed by Irmer, loc. cit.

He is not merely an eye-witness but one of the principal actors in the drama at Eger castle and afterwards at the Pachelbel house. On 28 February, Butler had advised the Emperor of MacDonell's imminent ride to Vienna and had stated expressly that the captain was the bearer of a relation written by himself in his own hand. Upon completion of his report MacDonell immediately set off for the capital. He was just about to pass through the gates of Eger when Butler sent him an urgent message informing him of the capture of the Duke of Lauenburg. Thereupon MacDonell returned to his colonel from whom he received additional orders, namely to convey to the Emperor that he, MacDonell, had seen Duke Franz Albrecht with his own eyes, and to hand over the papers found on him when he was seized containing aggravating material against Wallenstein. MacDonell arrived in Vienna on 4 March and it can be assumed that he amplified his relation with an account, in writing, of the most recent developments.

The original of this allegedly holograph relation has to this day not come to light. Its essence, to say the least, is, however, as Srbik has shown, contained in a long contemporary manuscript narrative in unliterary, even clumsy Italian, known as "Compilation L", so called by its discoverer, Srbik, after its archival location, a collectanea volume of papers of the renowned diplomat of Emperor Leopold I, Franz von Lisola, in the Vienna State Archives.¹ This compilation gives the whole story of Wallenstein's tragedy and begins with an account of the debt of gratitude owed by the Duke to the Emperor. This is followed by a translation of the "Pilsener Revers" of 12 January and an enumeration of Wallenstein's treasonable intentions and actions, whereupon the order issued to Piccolomini to apprehend him at Pilsen "dead or alive" is mentioned. The next portion is an almost verbatim translation of Leslie's relation in which certain factual mistakes occur. It is after this that MacDonell's report is worked in. In it Butler's officers and their exploits occupy the

iii. 286-96, from a partly decayed, partly deficient, manuscript copy in the Hauptstaatsarchiv Munich (the text was published as a pamphlet under two slightly different titles, Srbik, loc. cit. p. 146) he is spelt "Magdonal".

¹ Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 153 ff.; text *ibid.* pp. 321-9.

central position, MacDonell being familiarly referred to as "capitano Dionyggio". It further gives a detailed account of the capture of Duke Franz Albrecht. The end is a eulogy of the cavaliers and soldiers and their virtues, particularly their selflessness. This compilation prepared by a mind and hand unknown from a variety of sources, most likely at the instance of Butler and his brother-officers at an early date—one might think of the first half of March—and certainly meant for publication, was, a very little later, extensively drawn upon for publication purposes. It formed the basis of at least two important pamphlets which had their origin in closest proximity to government circles and were put into print long before the official version of the tragedy, the *Ausführlicher und gründlicher Bericht*, which condemned Wallenstein before the eyes of the world and justified the action taken by the Emperor and his government, and also the strongly defamatory yet not altogether uninformed accusation by the "loyal" councillor of the Prague Treasury, Johannes Putz von Adlersturn, the notorious *Perduellionis Chaos*, were launched.¹

Before returning to Captain Denis and his patriotic deeds, we have to take a glance at one or two other documents more or less connected with the "accessories". A very important relation, inspired by Piccolomini and corrected and edited by his secretary and adjutant Fabio Diodati before 21 April, was found by Mgr. Dr. Hubert Jedin in the Vatican Library in 1929.² It was compiled on the Emperor's orders and gives a good though merely historical conspectus of Wallenstein's treason and his plans against the Habsburg dynasty, and also of his, Piccolomini's, and Gallas' secret counter-action in Vienna. Though ending with the arrest of Wallenstein's chancellor Johann Eberhard Eltz on 1 March, it is, as regards the "execution", only of secondary significance. Two successive field chaplains of Butler, Thomas Carve, of Tipperary, and Patrick Taaffe, S.J., have left memoirs based, as they purport, on information received directly from Butler and his captain Walter Deveroux—yet another prime

¹ Pekař, loc. cit. i. 13 f. and ii, pp. 5 f.; Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 230-9.

² Hubert Jedin, "Die Relation Oktavio Piccolominis über Wallensteins Schuld und Ende", in *Zeitschrift des Vereins für die Geschichte Schlesiens*, Bd. 65 (1931), pp. 328-57.

actor as we shall see : the officer who killed Wallenstein. As for Carve, he was at the critical period in Ireland and can thus be eliminated as an accessory or as an eye-witness, and, though he may have learned some few details from Deveroux, his *Itinerarium* was not published before 1639 and deals with the events only retrospectively. Father Patrick Taaffe is doubtless the better observer, but he, too, did not disclose his knowledge by way of a letter to another priest in Regensburg before 1653 and must as Butler's friend and confidant be deemed biased.¹

The question we have to ask ourselves now must be formulated thus : is what follows a true and authentic English translation of MacDonell's relation ? Almost certainly not. The bombastic heading, which raises the "renowned Irish nation" to the rôle of "repayer & preserver of the magnificent howse of Austria", as well as the constantly recurring praise of Irish officers as the exclusively reliable and trustworthy ones in the imperial forces, are quite incompatible with any form in which official reports were at the time submitted to any government department or superior officer, let alone the Sovereign. At the same time, we do not think we can lightly dismiss the suspicion that the—untraceable—original of MacDonell's holograph account may soon after its presentation to the Emperor have been handed to the Spanish faction at the imperial court headed by the King of Hungary, and that it may at the instance of Castañeda and Oñate have been translated into Spanish for immediate transmission to the Council of State in Madrid, if only to convince Olivares of the futility of his illusions about Wallenstein's loyalty and professional integrity as an imperial officer. The title, in the form in which we find it, however, suggests even more : the translation was meant to be published and given the widest possible circulation. Who the linguist was who "couched" it in Spanish we have unfortunately been unable to discover. It is pure surmise to say that he may have been a clerk on the permanent embassy staff or have belonged to Oñate's suite. No biographical or bibliographical source consulted has yielded the slightest bit of information on Juan Pinzell de Rumeran or indeed given any lead to such. Likewise, we have to confess to complete ignorance regard-

¹ Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 147 f. ; text of Taaffe's letter *ibid.* pp. 330-2.

ing any specific reason for its being "re-couched" as it were into English and by whom and on whose request. Whilst it is quite possible that a Spanish copy reached the Secretary of State, or the second Viscount Conway, at some time in or other around 1634—the latter is known to have been a man "well versed in all parts of learning" and as having been "possessed of no mean powers as a scholar"¹—and was done into English for both or either of them, we have no documentary or other proof for such an assumption. Lastly, there are certain signs, to judge from the relevant text portion of Compilation L, that the Spanish version itself, if translated in its entirety, may have somewhat curtailed MacDonell's original text, provided always that what is now bound up with the State Papers is in itself complete and no part of it is missing. There does indeed seem to be some reason to believe that a rather significant little passage which must have more or less concluded the original relation was either intentionally omitted in the Spanish translation, or else our copy is deficient. It is the short speech with which Butler addressed MacDonell after having recalled him for additional instructions with regard to his report about the capture of Duke Franz Albrecht.²

Here, then, is the text of Captain Denis MacDonell's relation as contained in the State Papers. We shall supply annotations.

A relation exhibited at Vieña to his Imperiall Mat^{tie}. }
 in the yeare of our Lord 1634 by Captaine Denis }
 M^{ac} Donell Irish of the regim^t of Colonell Buttler }
 & most gratioously accepted as a token of eternall }
 memorye of the renowned Irish nation repayer & }
 preserver of the magnificent howse of Austria }
 to eternize their names in historyes of present & }
 future adges couched in Spanish by John Pinzell }
 de Rumeran a Biscani Spaniard borne in the }
 Province of Guipusca.

In the yeare afforsaid in the moneth of february Generalissimus Walstaine, Duke of Frittland, sendeth a straight Mandate from Pilsne to all Imperiall forces to give him meeting uppon the 22th of the same moneth with all their magazin uppon the white Mount neere Prage famous through the victory of the yeare 1620. Deeming it now full time to putt in execution the designes he had of a long time hatched; to which intent he prepared for his march from Pilsne towards the

¹ Cf. G. E. Cokayne's *Complete Peerage*. . . . New edn., revised and enlarged by Vicary Gibbs, iii (London, 1913), 401, particularly note (b).

² See *infra*, p. 386.

afforsaid place of armes. But havinge understood that his treachery was detected, the forces for the most part reestablished in their alleadgiance to Cesar, disawowinge any faith lately pledged unto him,¹ he determined to bend his course towards Eger, to which march he sommoneth the forces wintringe in the quarters aboute Pilsna, amongs which there was Colonell Water² Buttlers regiment of 1000 Dragoons, a stronge regiment of the Earle of Thirskes, another regiment of foot was left to guard Pilsna beinge the Arsinall, & the Lieutenant Colonell of the same sworne not to deliver the Cittye, where there was sixtye great peeces of artillery with a world of warlike munition without expresse commission from his Altes, vizt Valsteine & withall to have at a call all other provision thought necessarye for his interprise. He expected besides theise forces the two regiments of the Infanteria of Eger to be ready at his lievor;³ of theise had the commaund Lord Thirsky to whom John Gordon, Scotchman, was lieutenant & vicegouvernour of the Cittadell of Egar, & Coronell⁴ Brayner⁵ who wintered uppon the borders of the afforsaid cittye. Valstainer in his way to Egar attempted to corrupt Colonell Buttler through great offers & glorious promises in the presence of Thirsky & the rest of the chiefe officers of the armyes to gaine to sticke to⁶ him in his faction & ioyne with him in all his attempts. Colonell Buttler discoveringe by his carriadge the intended mischiefe, intereth into serious consultation with his countrymen officers in whose integritye & onely constancye he reposed confidence in a businesse of soe high and perillous a strayne; and to them he unfouldied the wicked stratagem of Valstaine, withall propoundinge how they might yeild prooffe of their loyaltye & faithfull service to God, the Emperour, the whole howse of Austria & to the Christian world by cuttinge⁷ off such an ungratious impe, who in lieu of gratitude for unpareleld favours brued detestable treacherye against the giver: whereupon they consulted whither were it better to kill him in the way or to apprehend his person & send him prisoner to the Emperour. The smale trust he reposed in the rest of his souldiers except the Irish, & the feare of the overreachinge strength of as well the rest as Thirskyes regiment who marched in the reare checked the execution of this generous intent for the present, & soe differred it to his cominge to Egar. Here he mett with an entyre friend of his, Lieutenant Gordon to whom & to his Sargeant Mayor Leslye, Scotchman [he] breaketh his secret. Whereuppon Buttler his sargeant maior Robert Fitz Gerald⁸ and fower other Irish captaines, with Irish underofficers were called to his counsell, namelye, Captaine Water⁹ Deurox,¹⁰ captaine Denis M^{ac}Donell, captaine Edmond Boorke,¹¹ & captaine John Browne. The resolution of this counsell was to venture life and fortune & to kill Valstain & the rest of his chiefe complices there present in testimonye of their zeale & willingnesse; they swore with drawen swords & bendinge knees to one another to be secrett & faithfull in the prosecution of this

¹ The "Pilsener Revers" of 12 January.

² Sic MS.

³ Corrupt form of "levée" in the sense of "meeting", or "assembly".

⁴ Sic MS.

⁵ Philipp Friedrich Freiherr von Breuner, 1601-38, who partook in all campaigns led by Wallenstein. In 1635 he captured Heidelberg which was stubbornly defended by the Swedish.

⁶ Superscript over "with" (deleted) MS.

⁷ Between "by" and "cuttinge" the syllable "putt" deleted MS.

⁸ Geraldin.

⁹ Sic MS.

¹⁰ Deveroux.

¹¹ Burke.

enterprise. Hereuppon each one received his owne chardge, capitaine Boorke & capitaine Browne allotted to oversee the watch & to order the dragoones in the streets to hinder any stirringe duringe the time of the execution. Sargeant Maior Geraldine appointed with a certaine number of Irish souldiers (to whose fidelitie this whole action was recommended) to kill generall Ilo; Capitaine Dennis MacDonell with 20 muscatyres to kill Walstaine, Capitaine Deuroxe with as many more to kill Thirskye, Kinskye & Newman. But providently, reflectinge that such a separation & division might scatter & extenuate their forces consistinge onelye of Irish (for noe other nation would they trust) they altered this resolution, & determined to procede a securer waye which was this, to witt, to invite theise last fower to supper, vižt, Earle Thirsky, Ilo, Lord Baron Kinskye & Capitaine Newman sometymes Walstaine[s] chauncelor & secretarye and now Earle Thirskyes capitaine of garde. Without further delaye Sargeant Maior Geraldine was sent to invite those gallants in the behalfe of Buttler & Gordon to supper to the castle, they answered the invitation and came thither in their coaches, beinge in the midst of supper iovally & drinking, fortye Irish souldiers & officers entered unto the castle by two & two through the Germanian garde, tollerated almost ¹ by the lieutenant of the Garde amongst whom was one Spaniard. They rancke themselves in the castle that if any tumult had bein raysed or their attempts not succede, they might make good some quarter for their safety: Capitaine Denis with twenty muscotyres is left to guard the foremost ² gate, that in case any of those principall heades might make an escape, he might prevent his goinge further. The hale where they supped had two doores; Sargeant Mayor Geraldine with eight souldiers came to one of theise doores: Capitaine Deuroxe with twelve came to the other: Geraldine advaunced his voyce & couradge, ruisheth in, with sword drawen, & cryeth, Vivat Ferdinandus Imperator, Deurox answereth t'entering the other, Et tota Domus Austriaca. The feastinge Lords beinge conscious of their owne guilt, surprised with fear & astonishment, attempteth tumultuously to rise from the table & stretch to their weapons; but Buttler with his complices slew Kinskye, Ilo and Newman at the same instant: though the lights were out, Thirsky, bruised with blowes, escaped woundlesse through the defence of a garment of prooffe he wore. He came to the first gate, where meetinge with Capitaine Dennis cryed unto him for quarter: the Capitaine demanded the watch word, he gives St. James: The Capitaine replyeth, The word is of the traytour Walstains givinge & not of the Emperours. Thirsky heruppon receiveth a heavey blowe in his head & upon his retyringe to the hale was knocked to death.³ Some of the servants of the Ilo & Thirskye gott to the same gate & in their furye made at the garde whereof two were wounded, but the servants were soone dispatched & cutt in peeces. This sceane of the tragedy beinge played in the

¹ Deleted MS.

² = foremost.

³ In Compilation L Trčka's last moments are described thus: "Haveva i Trczka si buon colieto, che anchor che havesse ricevuto più colpi, non fù però ferito, laonde fuggito di salle cerco verso le porte del castello haver scampo, ma vedutte le occupate gridò chiedendo quartiere, cui il capitano Dionyggio chiese il moto, et rispondendo il Trczka il moto dato dal Fridlando ciò è p. Giacomo ' non piu vale ' rispose il capitano, ' Austria è il nome ', è ciò detto l'uccise. Vi fu tra servi chi in difesa del padrone posero mano alle spade, ma doi di loro pagarono l'ardire col sangue, così gli altri lasciarono la zuffa. . . ." Sr bik, loc. cit. p. 326

castle, Colonell Buttler leaveth Gordon with a guard of Irish in the afforsaid Castle and commaundeth it to be soe guarded as none uppon any tearme may be suffered to goe in or out. Buttler with a select company of Irish Captaines & officers goeth from the Castle to the execution of Walstaine who lodged within the towne, & as they were goeing, out the gate in the thor . . . [?] ¹ slipped foorth a Padge of Thirskyes & runneth to the ladyes of Thirskye & Kinskye & to them revealeth the passadges of the castle. In the meane tyme, Buttler commaunds Leslye to rancke 100 dragoones in the marktett & streetes with straight mandatt that none of them should stirr out of their appointed place howsoever greate a tumult should be raysed. The affayers beinge thus ordered they heare a ruthfull crye of the Ladyes to ² whose hearing the death of their lords hath bein vented by the afforsaid page. Whereuppon Buttler was stirred to hasten the execution, seeinge the opportunitie which further delaye might turne to danger. He commaunds captaine Dennis to admonish Sargeant maior Leslye that the season of the execution was at hand : he commaunds captaine Deuroxe to Walstaine his howse, who, being out of his sleepe awaked by the cryes of the ladyes stood in his naked shirt at a windowe. Deurox curageously entereth & undertaketh to make short worke. As he entered some of the drawinge chambers next to Walstaines bedchamber, he was bouldly rebuked by some of the pages & servantes for his boysterous carriage, advertisinge how dangerous it was to disturbe his Altese uppon soe unreasonable an hower. One of Deurox his souldiers runneth this expostulating through & left him stone-dead, the rest fledd away. Walstaine his chamber haveinge two doors, Colonell Buttler stayeth to garde one, & appointeth Captaine Denis to follow Deurox & helpe him in the execution but before he came, Deurox breaketh open the door that he was appointed to enter uppon, though boulded & locked withinside & findinge Walstain standing behind the doore in his shirt, revyleth him sayinge : Thou unworthy traytor against thy master the Emperour & empire, here thou shalt dye, wherewith he runneth him through with a broade partisan edged of both sides, who without words or further resistance with stretched armes received his dyinge stroke,³ & uppon his fall to the ground gave such a belch of soe fearfull a noyse, that captaine Denis with the rest that were hastinge uppstayres, were, as they profest, amazed. They that were present doe swere that the fume of his belch was like the smoake of tobacco.⁴

¹ Paper rubbed MS.

² Superscript MS.

³ According to Gordon's relation, Wallenstein's last words before receiving the death stab, were, upon Deveroux' entering the room, a half stammered "*Ah Quartier !*" to which Deveroux brutally replied "*Du schlimmer meineidiger alter rebellischer Schelm*"—no time being granted to the victim between the executioner's insulting words and the actual killing. Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 192 and 315.

⁴ That this colourful but highly fantastic passage, which may serve to demonstrate how the somewhat hypocritical but at the time quite fashionable disapproval of smoking tobacco came to be used of Wallenstein's end, actually formed part of MacDonell's report, may be doubted. It is contained in an anonymous report from Vienna written in Latin and dated 8 March, the text of which was reproduced in one of the contemporary pamphlets entitled *Alberti Fridlandiae ducis proditio et caedes* and used in slightly different form in at least two more similar products. A manuscript copy, slightly damaged, of the Vienna report in P.R.O., S.P. 80/9, fol. 12^{r/v}, where the passage reads thus : "Constanter

One Neill Garne ¹ of a high stature tooke the body in his armes & would cast it forth the windowe had he bene suffered by the capitaines. At this execution were Colonell Buttler, Sargeant mayor Fitz Gerald, capitaine Deurox & capitaine Dennis McDonell : the rest of the capitaines stayed with sargeant mayor Leslye in the marquett place. Many others of Buttlers regiment would willingly be present & have a hand in this service whereof they gave sufficient demonstration in their journye from Pilsna, but that they were commaunded to keepe the watch. This greate service beinge effected they wrapped this unworthy carcassee in a coverlet & layd him under the table. Buttler searcheth the chauncelerye of Walstain & the studyes of all the rest of the lords that were killed, sealet with his signett all the papers he findeth & leaveth centenells to watch them untill further advertisement from the Emperour. These papers are thought to be of that importance as when they are produced strange matters to the worldes admiration wilbe detected. This beinge accomplished they take Walstaines bodye and carryed it in a coach to the castle (where) Gordon with the Irish garde was. The next day ensueinge ye 26th of February Buttler commaunded to keepe the gates of the citty stedfast & to suffer none to enter or to goe forth. In the meane time he consulted with the rest what was fitt to be don ; for they neither trusted citizens or souldiers of any other nation : but after some deliberation they admitted fower hundred muscatyers of Brayners regiment who together with Buttlers dragoones stood day & night in armes with match lighting & bullet in mouth. The 27th day of the same moneth Buttler with other officers went to parlye with Thirskyes regiment of horse and asked them whether they would serve the Emperour ; who answered with one accord that they would. Buttler heruppon chalketh out fifty of these horsemen, & together with his owne scowereth all the passadges rounde aboute Eager in hope to apprehend the Duke Frances Albertus Saxon generall of the duke of Saxoñ his armye who was expected that same verye day to come to Walstain ; but havinge not mett with him returned to Eager. The next day after, beinge the eight & twentieth of Februarye, Buttler appointed a troope of horse with a lieutenant as scoutes to harken after the enemye & to ride some distance aboute the passadges towards Eager : which troope beinge thus sent meeteth with the expected Franciscus Albertus accompanied with a smale trayne of servants & two trumpeters whom the lieutenant ceremoniously saluted, as beinge sent by Wallstain to conduct his excellencye to Eager : the other securely and confidently goeing on suspecting nothing lesse then the tragedy of Walstaines death his singular good friend ; the lieutenant abruptlye called unto him sayinge, Lord Duke : what if Colonell Buttler had sent you prisoner to the Emperour? The other surprised with a contumelious furye before he had allowance of much replying, his person was seised uppon in Buttlers behalfe, his coach ransacked and searched where a box of letters of huge importance was founde, which he posted to Buttler. The Duke seeinge that it was like to prove noe iesting matter, intreated the souldiers that were ransacking his coach and carriadge that they would leave him some linen for changinge. He was soone after brought to Eager & delivered to Colonell

adseverant, ad ictum tanquam maioris tormenti bellici bombum ex corpore eius intonuisse, *fumumque ex ore non secus ac si quis tabacum biberit, exivisse* ", Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 192 and 398. My italics.

¹ In the *Relationsbericht* etc. (see *ante*, p. 377 n. 5) this soldier is called Nielcarff. Irmer, loc. cit. iii. 293.

Buttler. Captain Denis being newlye goen for the gates towards Vienna, was recalled by a poast backe to Colonell Buttler.

Here ends—somewhat abruptly—the English translation of Captain Denis MacDonell's relation. Compilation L adds at this point : ¹

Haveva spedito il Buttler à Sua Maestà il capitano Dioniggio ² dando nova della morte dello Fridlando ; hora veduta sì bella preda nelle sue mani spedi chi richiamasse il detto capitano, volendo andassero queste nuove unite. Rittornò il detto capitano allhorche sedeva il Buttler à tavola con il duca, et entrato il capitano con voce alta : Signor capitano (disse il Buttler) direte à Sua Maestà che già l'ucello è in gabia et l'havete con vostri occhi veduto ; aggiundendo che non scrivo, ma mando in vece delle mie coteste lettere, quali ho trovato appresso questo mio prigioniero, et sia il signor con voi.

The nucleus of this solemn address by Butler, or the mere fact of it having been delivered, must, we may conclude, have been recorded in MacDonell's original relation. Are, then, some few lines missing in our copy ? Or did Juan Pinzell de Rumeran or whoever instructed him think that there was already enough self-praise and self-advertisement of Butler and his " cavaliers " in what had so far been " couched in Spanish " ?

Returning to London for one more moment, let us end with an extract from a letter written by that well-informed protestant divine—later to be one of King Charles' chaplains—John Durie, whom we have met before, to Sir Thomas Roe, dated Westminster, 16 April. Durie, who had, ever since his return from Germany where he had served as a Lutheran minister to the English company of merchants at Elbing, West Prussia, maintained valuable connections with protestant theologians and politicians, quotes letters from Erfurt (Thuringia) as his source when writing that " those that killed Wallenstein have made an apologie for themselves and shew reasons why they attempted such a fact without knowledge of the Emperours, for now they take all upon themselves and clear the Emperour. It is thought for certain that Wallestein had contracted with the French King and hadde received two millions in hand which now maketh the French King not well able to proceede in his designes, yet his

¹ Srbik, loc. cit. pp. 328 f.

² In the manuscript transcribed by Srbik the words " con le lettere " after " Dioniggio " are deleted.

Ambassador ¹ will be att the dyett ² and his commission to speake very bigge and words of threatning if they give him not Philipsburg. . . ."³

APPENDIX

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF A CONTEMPORARY FRENCH TRACT ON WALLENSTEIN'S CHARACTER

Introductory

The English translation of the anonymous and perhaps government-inspired French tract referred to on p. 358, note 1 of this paper is contained in a manuscript volume of transcripts and translations of miscellaneous historical documents and mainly political pamphlets in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, MS. G. 4. 8. The small-folio tome formed part of the library of Sir Jerome Alexander, Justice of the Common Pleas, who died in 1670 (before 10 August, when his will was proved in Dublin) and bequeathed the bulk of his extensive collection of legal and political books and manuscripts to Trinity College where they were received in 1674.⁴ Attention to the volume was first drawn by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, whose report on the College's manuscripts entitles it, not very accurately, *Characters of Projectors and Puritans*.⁵ There are altogether nineteen items collected in this volume of which our translation, fol. 69^r-72^v, is the sixth, placed between *An Experimental Discovery of y^e General Defects of all sorts of Wines, with helps for y^e same. Collected by H. B. and A True Relation of Sir Rich Weston, Lord Treas^r., his negotiations with the Archdutchess in 1622*.⁶

The fact that the volume was—as it may have been for a number of years—made up and in the possession of Sir Jerome Alexander at the time of his death helps at once in dating the manuscript more closely. The French tract must have been translated and the translation copied between 1634 and 1670 and the script cannot therefore be described as of "late seventeenth century" date. It is perhaps best characterised as a corrected fair copy. The translator or copyist, whose

¹ Feuquières.

² At Frankfort.

³ P.R.O., S.P. 16/265, fol. 141^v; incomplete in *Cal. S.P. Dom., 1633-1634*, p. 554 (no. 73). There is no reason to suspect that Wallenstein had made specific promises to the French with regard to that strategically important and fortified crossing point directly on the bank of the Rhine, near Bruchsal.

⁴ Cf. Charles Rogers, "Notes in the History of Sir Jerome Alexander", in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 1st ser., ii (1873), 94-141; and F. Elrington Ball, *The Judges in Ireland 1221-1921* (New York, 1927), i. 284-6 and 348 f.

⁵ 8th Report, part 1 (1881), Appendix, p. 584, col. 2.

⁶ A detailed table of contents is given by Thomas K. Abbott, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College* (Dublin, 1900), pp. 148 f. who, giving no heading or date, assigns to the volume the number "MS. 861". This is not the official press mark. Sir Jerome's manuscripts were arranged in Press G, shelves 3 and 4 of the Library, hence the volume is known as MS. G. 4. (no.) 8.

ductus is somewhat crude, aimed, generally speaking, at legibility, yet made mistakes both in wording and spelling necessitating numerous corrections.¹ A careful collation with the printed French text in the State Papers satisfies us, however, as to the accuracy and completeness of the translation.

As a matter of interest it should be added here that during the earlier stages of his career, particularly after 1626, Sir Jerome was employed under the auspices of Edward, second Viscount Conway in connection with the administration of the latter's estates in counties Down and Armagh and on other duties in the province of Ulster.²

Herewith the transcript.

Walsteins Character
Or
The life and Maximes of
the Duke of
Fridland ³

The Duke of Fridland, commonly called Walstein, was tall of stature, slender, leane, & allmost perpetually mallanchollyc. From a private gentleman he had bin advanced to supream charge, such as formerly had not binn conferred on any other and of a subiect became a soveraigne being honnored with fower very good dukedoms, to witt, Fridlandt, Glogav, Suagan ⁴ and Meckelbourge, lastly with the title of Excellency from whence hee ⁵ arrived to the title of Illustrious Highnes ⁶ which was given him by allmen. He was much honnored by his owne and foraigne souldiers by whome, once knowne, hee was almost adored. He was rigorous and pardoned noe fault nor suffered he any man to passe unrewarded whoe beare himself bravely. He punished severely and gave librally. Above all, he expected extraordinary obedience and reverence. He had as splendid a Courte as any soveraigne prince could have and well treated those whoe served him but whosoever sought to be inrolled in his service was to take very good heed for he dismissed none unlesse it came of his own accord. Nor would he that any other spake for him, for if any did he was sure to be cast into prison or to fare worse. He punctually paid his servants and would have them well provided for and orderly.

There was not any in his Courte whose nativity he would not cause to be cast (afforehand) by astrologers whome he perpetually had aboute him. These kind of people were very pretious with him for he was not onely a very good master in his art but above all things infinitely delighted therein. He likewise made the nativities of all his colonells and commanders to be calculated in this matter of auguries and foretelling of the Romain Rules. There was an astrologian in his

¹ I wish to record my gratitude to the Librarian of Trinity College, Dublin, for kindly providing me with photostat copies of the relevant folios.

² Rogers, loc. cit. p. 107.

³ Heading on covering fol. (69^r; 69^v blank) repeated at commencement of text (fol. 70^r).

⁴ "u" suprascript *MS*

⁵ hee suprascript *MS*.

⁶ h suprascript *MS*.

court much esteemed named Signor John Baptista Seni a Genoan borne, to whome he gave 2000 Rex Dollors ¹ for an Intertaynment and the fredome of the table of the greatest ² cavileirs of his court, not withstandinge that Seni had binn a poore scrivener ³ residing in the howse (of) Rapata, a marchant of Vienna. He had fore(cast) many things which succeedinge the Duke gave him for addition of bounty 6000 Rex Dollors in goods.⁴ He would not suffer any man to come into his courte nor nere the place of his abode either on horse backe or in coach. In his Anticamera he had aboute threscore gallants, princes and men of princely qualities, yet no more noyse was to be heard there ⁵ then in a devoute church. If any one speake alowde, were he a man of qualitee he was reprehendyd, but if of meaner ranck, he caused him to be bastanaded by some intertayned to that purpose. Wheresoever he came, he instantly comanded all cats and doggs to be killed not induring in any sorte to heare a noise. No collonell nor officer of foote service might weare bootes or spurs and this under most heavey penallties which without remission were inflicted. He changed the sound of drumme and trumpetts having found out others to his liking. The companies both horse and foote must have all necessary provision. When he went out of his howse either on ⁶ horse backe or in coach he was not pleased that any one should stand to salute him, nor that any body should behold or looke on him or salute him as he passed. Noe man might have audience or speake to him of what condition soever he were, but he must be first seen in courte where having taken his ⁷ phisiognomye (which he in private endeavored to see) if he disliked him not, he called him to him and used him graciously and if it came into his head would conferre many honors and extraordinary favours upon him. When any one came into the chamber he must be very circumspecte in doing reverence and speaking to him, for if too ceremonious, he turned himself to the other and spake no more. When he commanded, no man must open his mouth but execute without replye. He had in his court men versed in all sciences, payeing them well not soe much for instruccion of his pages as for applause and greatness to have men famous and excellent in all professions. He tooke noe pleasure in musick, huntinge or any other pastime being very seriously bent to dissipach buisnesses, to study plots and understand from astrologye what might happen from day to day, wherein he infinitlye excelled: he was very liberall and when he gave greate presents he verye much reioysed and indeed was a man whoe gave most to him whoe least expected it, but his giftts were golden snares which indissoluebly obliged and wherein he who was tyed must take heed not to offende him, for in an instant he forfeited his life. No letters of recomendacion must be brought to him although

¹ = Reichs-Taler.

² "the greatest" suprascript MS.

³ "scrivener" suprascript MS.

⁴ Unpublished researches by Dr. Josef Bergl seem to suggest that Giovanni Battista Seni (1600-1656; in Friedlands service since 1629) was during the last few months of Wallenstein's life employed by Gallas and Piccolomini as an intelligence agent in the Duke's suite, supplying information about his plans and movements. See the Addendum on Seni by Taras von Borodajkewycz in *Srbik*, loc. cit. pp. 441 ff.

⁵ "there" suprascript MS.

⁶ "on" suprascript MS.

⁷ "his" suprascript MS.

from Princes and when any one unexperienced ¹ presented him with any such, he reade them not nor would he cast an eye upon what was sent. He would not have in his army any collonell but such as were made by himselfe, most of which were men of meane condition raysted onely by him to greatnes to the end that they should be the better affected unto him. The more partiall and dependant and the old especially such as were souldiers of note, he entertayned because he could doe noe lesse, but they were so little respected and so ill intreated that it was necessary for them to have their charges and seeke out other services. He kepte the Army together, for although he gave no money, he at least held them in hope and suffered them not to want bread, for he caused it to be made from the Emperours hereditary provinces which they through fear consented very willingly unto : not dareing to doe otherwise. His principall aime in this warre was ² to draw it at length ; to intertayne the Army ; to practise deversions, as if he would remove some confederate, stirre up the Polax ³ or some other prince or to attempte some treason concerned by the French.

To conclude this Relacion I say that the Duke of Fridlandt was severe, liberall and ⁴ prowde, an excellent Politician and a Greate Machivilian //

Finis

¹ "experienced" *MS.* This is an obvious lapse on the part of the translator or copyist, as the French text clearly runs " & quand quelqu'un *mal pratiqué* les luy presentoit ". . .

² "was" *suprascript MS.*

³ = Polaks, or Polacks, i.e. the Poles.

⁴ "and" *suprascript MS.*

THE HOUSEHOLD OF QUEEN MARGARET OF ANJOU, 1452-3

By A. R. MYERS, M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A.

SENIOR LECTURER IN MEDIEVAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF LIVERPOOL
(continued)

fol. 6a (*contd.*)

Adhuc recepta denariorum de custumis in portu ville Suthampton

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Thoma Coke et Johanne Somerton collectoribus custumarum in portu ville predictae de parte Mccclxxiiij.li.xv.s.vij.d. de quadam summa MMMDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d., videlicet Dlxiiiij.li.xiiij.d. anno xxv^{to} Regis Henrici sexti ac Mvj.li.ix.s.iiij.d. anno xxvij^o et MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. anno xxviiij^o eiusdem Regis prefate Regine debita de MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. de supradictis MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. concessis et assignatis eidem Regine, habendis et percipiendis annuatim ad terminum vite sue ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis per equales porciones in partem dotis sue ad scaccarium Regis heredum et successorum suorum, per manus thesaurarii et camerariorum eiusdem scaccarii pro tempore existentium, tam de primis denariis provenientibus de proficuis vicecomitum et escaetorum Regis heredum et successorum suorum quam de quibuscumque alijs exitibus proficuis, firmis, debitis, et reuencibus ad idem scaccarium soluendis, quousque idem dominus Rex heredes et successores sui eidem Regine de terris, tenementis, redditibus, et alijs possessionibus ad valorem dictarum MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. infra regnum Anglie in partem dotis sue seu alias ad terminum vite sue habendum fecerint providere et recompensare, videlicet, de quodam assignamento MMMDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. per dictum Regem eidem Regine anno xxvij^o predicto habendum et percipiendum eidem Regine de quibuscumque denariis provenientibus et crescentis, tam de subsidio duodecim denariorum de libra et trium solidorum de dolio quam de subsidio lanarum et pellium lanutarum in portu predicto et singulis portubus et locis eidem portui adiacentibus, per manus custumariorum siue collectorum eorundem subsidiorum ibidem pro tempore existentium, per restitutionem diuersarum talliarum summam predictam continencium pro eadem Regine pro clamio suo annuo ad scaccarium Regis nuper leuatarum de Thoma Pounce et Thoma Coke collectoribus custumarum et subsidiorum in portu ville Suthampton dampnandarum et adnichillandarum per literas eiusdem Regis patentes ¹ datas decimo die Aprilis anno xxvij^o dicti Regis Henrici sexti penes receptorem generalem Regine remanentem vltra MMcciiiiij.li.ij.s.viiij.d. in compoto de anno xxx^m^o eiusdem Regis oneratos et ad ij vices, videlicet prima vice

Summa pagine—————Dccciijvj.li.xix.s.viiij.d.ob.

¹ C.P.R. 1446-1452, p. 267.

fol. 6b

Adhuc recepta denariorum de custumis in portu ville Suthampton

xx^{mo} die Octobris supradicto anno xxxij^{do} per manus Thesaurarij Anglie et Johannis Wode ad manus Johannis Norrys M.li. et secunda vice xxvj^{to} die Januarij eodem anno per manus Johannis Wode xiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d. per duas indenturas inde penes customarios predictos remanentes—M.xiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d.

De ccclx.li.viiij.s.xj.d. residuis supradictorum Mccclxxiiij.li.xv.s.vij.d. prefate Regine per dictum Regem Henricum sextum per literas suas patentes in forma predicta assignatorum hoc anno non reddit, eo quod restant nondum soluti. De quibus quidem ccclx.li.viiij.s.xj.d. predicti collectores vel collector ibidem pro tempore existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recepit———nihil.

Nec reddit de M marcis¹ de quodam assignamento per dictum Regem Henricum sextum prefato Regine facto per literas ipsius Regis patentes predictas in forma supradicta pro denariis quos prefata Regina pro eodem domino Rege ante decimum diem Aprilis anno xxvij^o dicti Regis Henrici sexti ex certa sciencia sua soluit et contentauit, habendis et percipiendis eidem Regine de quibuscumque denariis prouenientibus et crescentibus tam de subsidio duodecim denariorum de libra et trium solidorum de dolio quam de subsidio lanarum et pellium lanutarum in portu predicto et singulis portubus et locis eidem portu adiacentibus, per manus customariorum siue collectorum eorundem subsidiorum ibidem pro tempore existentium, eo quod restant nondum soluti. De quibus quidem M marcis collectores predicti vel collector ibidem pro tempore existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recepit———nihil.

Summa———Mxiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d.

Recepta denariorum ad receptam scaccarij Regis²

De MDiiijxvj.li.v.s.v.d. de parte MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. de supradictis MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. concessis et assignatis dicte Regine, habendis et percipiendis annuatim ad terminum vite sue ad terminos Pasche et sancti Michelis archangeli per equales porciones in partem dotis sue ad scaccarium Regis heredum et successorum suorum per manus thesaurarij et camerariorum eiusdem scaccarij pro tempore existentium, tam de primis denariis prouenientibus de proficuis, firmis, debitis, et reuencibus ad idem scaccarium soluendis, quousque idem dominus Rex heredes et successores sui eidem Regine, de terris, tenementis, redditibus, et alijs possessionibus ad valorem dictarum MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. infra regnum Anglie in partem dotis sue seu alias ad terminum vite sue habendum fecit prouidere et recompensare et pro anno xxix^{mo} Regis predicti eidem Regine debitis non reddit, eo quod restant nondum soluti, nec aliquae tallie ex assignacione inde habentur et non plus quia dicta Regina percepit lxj.li.xij.s.vj.d. de exitibus et proficuis manerij de Berkhamstede ad valorem xl marcarum per annum ab viij^o die Junij anno eiusdem Regis xxvj^{to} vsque festum Sancti Michelis anno xxix^{mo} in partem recompensacionis satisfacionis et deducionis dicte summe MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. infra summam MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. habendum———nihil.

fol. 7a. See footnote to fol. 8a

fol. 7b (Blank)

¹ C.P.R. 1446-1452, p. 267.

² Rot. Parl. v. 120b.

Adhuc recepta denariorum ad receptam scaccarij Regis

Nec reddit de MDxij.li.viii.s.vj.d. de parte MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. de predictis MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. concessis et assignatis dicte Regine, habendis et percipiendis annuatim ad terminum vite sue ad terminos predictos equaliter in partem dotis sue ad scaccarium Regis heredum et successorum suorum, per manus thesaurarij et camerariorum eiusdem scaccarij pro tempore existentium vt supra, et eidem Regine pro anno xxx^m dicti Regis Henrici vj^{ti} debitis non receptis, eo quod restant nondum soluti, nec alique tallie ex assignacione inde habentur et non plus quia dicta Regina percepit exitus et proficua manerij de Berkhamsted ¹ ad valorem xl marcarum per annum, ac xxj.li.xiiij.s.j.d.ob. de exitibus et proficuis feodifirme ville Bristoll' a xiiij^o die Julij anno dicti Regis Henrici vj^{ti} xxix^o vsque festum

Sancti Michelis extunc proxime sequentem, necnon ^{xx}iiijxvij.li.ij.s.xj.d.ob. de exitibus et proficuis domaniorum et maneriorum de Hauerford West, ²Pembrok, ³Kilgarran, et Llanstephan, a xxiiij^m die Julij dicto anno xxix^m vsque dictum festum Sancti Michelis extunc proxime sequentem in partem recompensacionis satisfaccionis et deduccionis dicte summe MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. infra predictam summan MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. habendum———nihil.

Nec reddit de Mvij.li.iiij.s.viii.d. de parte MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. de supradictis MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. concessis et assignatis dicte Regine, habendis et percipiendis annuatim modo quo supra et eidem Regine anno xxxj^m debitis, eo quod restant nondum soluti, neque alique tallie ex assignacione inde habentur et non plus, quia dicta Regina percepit exitus et proficua manerij de Berkhamsted ad valorem xl marcarum per annum ac exitus et proficua domanij et comitatus Pembrok ad valorem cccc.li.ij.s.viii.d. per annum, necnon exitus et proficua domanij de Hauerford West ad valorem cxxj.li.ij.s.ix.d. per annum et exitus et proficua feodifirme ville Bristoll' ad valorem cij.li.xv.s.vj.d. per annum in partem recompensacionis satisfaccionis et deduccionis dicte summe MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. infra dictam summan MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. habendum———nihil.

Nec reddit de Dcccxxviiij.li.xv.d. de parte MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. de supradictis MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. concessis et assignatis eidem Regine habendis vt supra et sibi pro anno xxxij^o debitis, eo quod restant nondum soluti, et non plus, quia dicta Regina percipit xl marcas de exitibus et proficuis domanij de Berkhamsted, cccc.li.ij.s.viii.d. de exitibus ⁴maneriorum de Gillyngham * (et Odyham, domanij de Rokyngham, manerij de Briggestok, feodifirma ville Suthampton, feodifirma ville Norwici, feodifirma ville Gippewici, feodifirma ville Notyngham, firma ville Derb', feodifirma vilate de Kyngesthorp, et feodifirma ville Ripe Regine, in recompensacione domanij et comitatus de Pembroke, cxxj.li.ij.s.ix.d. de exitibus ^{xx}domanij de Hauerford West, cij.li.xv.s.vj.d. feodifirme ville Bristoll') iiijx.li.xvj.s.

¹ BULLETIN, xl (1957), 101, n. 5. ² Ibid. 104, n. 2. ³ Ibid. 104, n. 1.

⁴ Odiham, Gillingham, Rockingham, Brigstock, with the the fee-farms of Southampton, Norwich, Ipswich, Nottingham, Derby, Kingsthorp, and Queenhithe were all granted in 1453 as part of the compensation for the loss of Pembroke (*Rot. Parl.* v. 261b, 262a); cf. BULLETIN, xl (1957), 105, nn. 1 and 2; *ibid.* 108, n. 3, 109, n. 1.

* The section in brackets was omitted by the writer of the account and was included on a strip of parchment, fol. 7. sewn into the account between fols. 6b & 8a.

v.d. de exitibus et proficuis ~~manerij de Bradwell~~ (sic) cum pertinentibus manerij de Haueryng-atte-Boure ¹ cum pertinentibus domanij siue manerij de Hadley cum pertinentibus feodifirme ville Colcestr' et firme manerij de Redwell alias Ryddeswell in comitatu Essex ad valorem clvj.li. per annum a primo die Marcij anno xxxj^{mo} vsque festum Sancti Michelis extunc proxime, scilicet per eundem annum et xxx dies, ac lv.li.vj.s.iiij.d. de exitibus et proficuis villatarum de Kingescliff, Briggestroke, Kyngesthorp, Corby, et manerij de Morehende in comitatu Norhampon ad

valorem iiijxv.li. per annum per tempus supradictum, necnon c.s.vj.d. de exitibus et proficuis domanij et foreste de Fekenham ad valorem xxv.li.vj.s.viiij.d. per annum a xix^o die Junij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} vsque festum Sancti Michelis extunc proxime sequentem, scilicet per lxxij dies, et xxvij.li.xix.s.iiij.d. de exitibus et proficuis duarum partium manerij de Bradewell in comitatu Essex ad xlviiij.li. per annum a primo die Marcij anno xxxj^o vsque festum sancti Michelis anno tunc proxime sequente per dimidium annum et xxx dies in partem recompensacionis satisfaccionis et deduccionis dicte summe MDclvij.li.xvij.s.xj.d. infra predictam summam MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. habendum———nihil.

Recepta denariorum mutuatorum

De c.li. de parte D.li. Regi per supradictam Reginam mutuatis resoluendis et satisfaciendis eidem Regine super literis patentibus Regis,² tam de custuma et subsidio Regis in portu ville Suthampton' quam de custuma et subsidio Regis in portu ciuitatis Regis Londonie, hoc anno non reddit, eo quod restant nondum soluti. De quibus quidem c.li. collectores in portubus predictis existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recepit———nihil.

Summa pagine———Nullum.

fol. 8b

Aurum Regine

De xxvj.s.viiij.d. de auro Regine vocato Quenesgold proveniente de quibuscumque finibus in aliquibus curiis domini Regis factis per aliquos sponte oblationes eidem Regi factos, se extendent ad summam x marcarum, vnam marcam Regine et sic iuxta quantitatem maioris siue minoris summe, videlicet, de huiusmodi auro Regine pertinente et anno xxv^{to} Regis Henrici sexti debito de quodam fine³ xx marcarum facto per abbatem et conuentum monasterij de Hayles pro licencia quod ipsi terras et tenementa ad annum valorem vij marcarum vltra onera, que de Rege non tenentur in capite, de quibuscumque personis sibi placuerit perquirere, valeant tenenda sibi et successores suis ad manum mortuam non reddit, eo quod aliquos denarios inde minime recepit nec recipere potuit——nihil.

¹ For the revenues from Havering-at-Bower, Hadley, Colchester, Redwell, Kingscliff, Brigstock, Kingsthorp, Corby, and Moor End, see *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 340; also *BULLETIN*, xl(1957), 105, n. 6.

² These letters patent do not appear to have been enrolled.

³ There is no precise reference in the chancery enrolments to this transaction, which may, however, be connected with the grant for life to the abbot and convent of Hayles to be quit of the levying of tithes, charges, and subsidies, except in Rutland, for a fine of 20 marks paid into the hanaper (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 406, 21 February 1446).

Nec reddit de xxvj.s.viii.d. de huiusmodi auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ¹ xx marcarum facto per Johannam nutricem domini Regis et alios duos parochianos ecclesie parochialis sancti Botolphi extra Aldresshgate Londonie dicto anno xxv^{to} pro licencia quod ipsi seu duo vel vnus eorum aut executores vel assignatores sui seu eorum aliquis vnam fraternitatem siue gildam de vno magistro et duobus custodibus de fratribus ac sororibus de parochianis eiusdem ecclesie in ecclesia predicta incipere fundare et stabilire valeant seu valeat perpetuis futuris temporibus duraturis; et quod prefatus magister et custodes ac fratres et sorores sui terras et tenementa et redditus cum pertinentibus ad valorem decem marcarum per annum in Londonia, que de Rege non tenentur in liberum burgagium, perquirere possint et tenere sibi et successoribus suis ad manum mortuam causa predicta———nihil.

Nec reddit de xl.s. de consimili auro eidem Regine pertinente de quodam fine ² xx.li. facto per abbatem et conuentum de Whitby anno xxv^{to} predicto pro confirmacione quarundam cartarum et literarum diuersorum regum eisdem abbati et conuentui de certis libertatibus et franchises factarum clausula licet habendis etc causa predicta———nihil.

De xxxvj.s. de consimili auro dicte Regine pertinente de quodam fine ³ xviii.li. facto per abbateri et conuentum de Hida iuxta Wynton' pro licencia quod ipse et successores sui terras tenementa et redditus cum pertinentibus, que de Rege in capite seu de aliis per seruicium militare tenentur, ad valorem xx.li. per annum acquirere possint et tenere sibi et successoribus suis ad manum mortuam et prefate Regine dicto anno xxix^{no} debitis hoc anno non reddit, eo quod aliquos huiusmodi denarios inde minime recepit nec recipere potuit———nihil.

Nec reddit de xxiii.s. de huiusmodi auro eidem Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁴ xij.li. predicto anno xxv^{to} facto per Thomam Badby ciuem et piscenarium Londonie et alios pro licencia quod ipsi tres vel duo ipsorum quandam canteriam perpetuam fraternitatem in honorem Sancti Johannis Baptiste et Assumpcionis Beate Marie de vno capellano perpetuo diuina in singulis diebus ad altare gloriosi Confessoris, Sancti Michelis, et Beate Katerine virginis in ecclesia parochiali Sancti Johannis Baptiste de Dunberry in comitatu Essex imperpetuum celebratura facere fundare et stabilire valeant, et quod idem capellanus cantarie predictae, postquam ea sic fundata et stabilita fuerit, terras tenementa et redditus ad valenciam c.s. per annum, que de Rege non tenentur, de quacumque persona ea ei dare concedere siue assignare volente seu volentibus perquirere posset, tenenda sibi et successoribus suis in sustentacionem suam imperpetuum causa supradicta———nihil.

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Anna Cobham, domina de Sterburgh, et aliis, de consimili auro prefate Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁵ xl marcarum in cancellaria domini Regis facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsa et alii manerios de

¹ *C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 451 (9 July 1446).

² *Calendar of Charter Rolls, 1427-1516*, p. 51. (3 December 1445) ("Inspeximus and confirmation . . . in favour of Hugh, the abbot, and the convent of Whitby of letters patent dated at Westminster, 25 April, 24 Henry VI, not found on the Patent Roll . . .").

³ *C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 459 (15 July 1446).

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 357 (25 August 1445).

⁵ *C.P.R. 1446-1452*, pp. 240-1 (1 March 1449).

Hexstowe et Bylesherssh et alias terras et tenementa ad valenciam xij.li. per annum dare possent et concedere ad manum mortuam imperpetuum———liij.s.iiij.d.

Et de Thoma Lane, clerico, et aliis executoribus Willelmi Sponne, de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine¹ xx marcarum per ipsos facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi quandam cantariam de duobus capellanis diuina singulis diebus ad altare Beate Marie in ecclesia parochiali Sancti Laurencij de Toucestr' celebratura fundare creare et stabilire possent———xxvj.s.viiij.d.

Summa pagine———iiij.li.

fol. 9a

Adhuc aurum Regine

Et de Johanne, archiepiscopo Cantuariensis, et aliis, de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine² xx marcarum in dicto cancellario facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi quandam fraternitatem siue gildam in honore Sancte Trinitatis de vno capellano diuina singulis diebus in quadam capella Sancti Johannis Baptiste in villa de Westbarnet scituata celebratura fundare erigere et stabilire possent———xxvj.s.viiij.d.

Et de Roberto Roo, clerico, et aliis executoribus testamenti Roberti Darcy de comitatu Essex armigeri defuncti, de consimili auro Regine vt supra pertinente de quodam fine³ xxvij marcarum in dicta cancellaria facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi quandam cantariam de duobus capellis diuina singulis diebus ad altare Sancte Trinitatis in ecclesia Omnium Sanctorum de Maldon fundare possent———xxxvj.s.

Et de Johanne Sudbury clerico et aliis de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine⁴ xviiij.li.iiij.s.iiij.d. in dicta cancellaria Regis facto, pro licencia habenda quod cum quedam gilda siue fraternitas Sancte Trinitatis in ecclesia parochiali de Louth per ipsos pretextu literarum Regis patencium fundata fuerit, aldermannus fratres et sorores eiusdem gilde terras et tenementa ad valenciam x.li. adquirere possent ad manum mortuam imperpetuum———xxxvj.s.v.d.

Et de Thoma Forester capellano, et aliis, de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine⁵ xx marcarum in dicta cancellaria facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi terras et tenementa ad valorem xij.li. per annum dare possent primo capellano et aliis capellanis cuiusdam in cantarie ecclesie Beate Marie Magdalene de Newark, tenendas sibi et successoribus suis ad manum mortuam imperpetuum———xxvj.s.viiij.d.

Et de Hugone Ellerton Abbate de Whitby, de huiusmodi auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine⁶ xx.li. in predicta cancellaria Regis facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipse et successores sui ecclesiam parochialem de Hoton Bussell' Eboracensis diocese appropriare et eam in proprios usus suos tenere possent sibi et successoribus suis———xls.

Et de magistro Georgio Radcliff, archidiacono Cestrie, de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine⁷ xx.li. in dicta cancellaria per ipsum facto, pro

¹ C.P.R. 1447-1452, pp. 204-5 (17 November 1448).

² Ibid. p. 265 (30 April 1449).

³ Ibid. 1446-1452, p. 312 (15 December 1450).

⁴ Ibid. pp. 405-6 (7 October 1450).

⁵ Ibid. pp. 450-1 (28 April 1451).

⁶ Ibid. p. 520 (6 February 1452).

⁷ Ibid. p. 549 (24 May 1452).

licencia habenda quod ipse et executores sui terras tenementa et redditus ad valorem c.s. per annum dare possit et assignare ad manum mortuam imperpetuum xl.s.

Et de Johanne Makerell, perpetuo vicario ecclesie Sancti Olai in veteri Iudaismo Londonie, et aliis, de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ¹ x.li. in dicta cancellaria facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi certum messuagium scituum in parochia Sancti Laurencij in veteri Iudaismo adquirere possent, tenendum sibi et successoribus suis imperpetuum in liberam puram et perpetuam elemosinam—xx.s.

Et de Johanne Hopton, armigero, de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ² xx.li. in dicta cancellaria facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipse dare possit et assignare cuidam capellano perpetuo cuiusdam cantarie perpetue diuina singulis diebus infra parochiam de Bliburgh in comitatu Suffolk' celebratura decem marcas redditus percipienda annuatim eidem capellano et successoribus de manerijis de Bliburgh et Wyset imperpetuum—xl.s.

Et de Nicholao Seintlo, armigero de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ³ l. marcarum in dicta cancellaria facto pro custodia terre et heredis Thome Mountford habenda vna cum maritagio eiusdem heredis—lxvj.s.vijj.d.

Et de Thoma Halewey et Johanna vxore eius, de consimili auro pertinente de quodam fine ⁴ xxxj.li. per ipsos in cancellaria predicta facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi quandam cantariam perpetuam de vno capellano in ecclesia Omnium Sanctorum Bristoll' infra diocesam Wigorniensem fundare possent—lxijj.s.j.d.

Et de Thoma Dacre, domino de Dacre, milite, et Philippa, vxore eius, de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁵ vij.li. quem fecerunt cum domino Rege in dicta cancellaria sua, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi maneriam de Irthyngton et Leysyngby alias terras et tenementa in comitatu Cumbrie que de Rege tenentur in capite dare possent et assignare Willelmo Marschall' clerico et aliis—xiiij.s.

Summa pagine—xix.li.ix.s.vj.d.

fol. 9b

De xx.s. de consimili auro dicte domine Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁶ x.li. facto per Johannem Deen, magistrum domus elemosinarum Sanctorum Johannis Baptiste et Johannis Euangeliste de Shirburn, pro licencia habenda quod ipse terras et tenementa ad valorem xxxijj.li.vj.s.vijj.d. per annum adquirere possit sibi successoribus suis imperpetuum hoc anno non reddit, eo quod aliquos denarios inde minime recepit nec recipere potuit—nihil.

Nec reddit de xijj.s.iiij.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁷ x marcarum facto per Jacobum Lutrell', filium et heredes Johannes Lutrell', militis, pro licencia habenda quod ipse castrum et burgum de Dunster et alia maneria, que de Rege tenentur in capite, dare possit et concedere Edwardo Stradlyng et alijs, causa predicta—nihil.

¹ C.P.R. 1446-1452, p. 572 (1 February 1452).

² Ibid. p. 567 (17 December 1451).

³ Ibid. p. 275 (17 November 1448).

⁴ Ibid. p. 250 (18 May 1448).

⁶ Ibid. p. 201 (24 October 1448).

⁵ Ibid. p. 545 (16 May 1452).

⁷ Ibid. p. 284 (5 February 1449).

Nec reddit de xxij.s.j.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ¹ xj.li.xj.s. per Johannem, nuper Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem, et alios, in cancellaria predicta facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi quandam fraternitatem siue gildam de vno magistro et duobus custodibus fratribus et sororibus incipere fundare et erigere valerent, causa qua supra—nihil.

Nec reddit de xij.s.iiij.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ² x marcarum per Ricardum, Ducem Ebor', facto in cancellaria Regis predicta, pro licencia habenda quod ipse manerium de Hamulton cum pertinentibus dare possit et concedere Willelmo Episcopo Loncoln' et alijs, causa antedicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de xxvj.s.vij.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ³ xx marcarum per dictum Ricardum, Ducem Ebor', et Cecilia, uxore eius, in cancellaria predicta facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi castrum manerium villam et dominium de Nerberth cum pertinentibus, que de Rege tenentur in capite, dare possent et concedere Johanni Episcopo Meneuense et alijs, causa predicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de xxvj.s.vij.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁴ xx marcarum in dicta cancellaria per Johannem Thirlond, magistrum siue custodem fraternitatis siue gilde in ecclesia Sancti Botholphi, facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipse terras, tenementa, et redditus ad valorem x marcarum per annum perquirere possit ad manum mortuam imperpetuum, causa supradicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de xl.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁵ xx.li. per Edmundum Brudenell' et alios executores testamenti Willelmi Whaplode defuncti facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi quandam cantariam de vno capellano in ecclesia de Chalfhunte Sancti Petri in comitatu Buk' fundare erigere et stabilire possent, causa predicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de xxiiij.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁶ xij.li. per Johannem Seymore, militem, in dicta cancellaria facto, pro pardonacione habenda de transgressionem quam fecit acquirendo sibi de Willelmo Ryneburn, armigero, manerium de Fikilden, quod de Rege tenetur in capite, licencia regia inde non optenta, causa supradicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de liij.s.iiij.d. de consimili auro pertinente de quodam fine ⁷ xl. marcarum per Willelmum Asshe et alios facto, pro pardonacione habenda de transgressionem quam fecerunt acquirendo sibi et heredibus suis de Johanne Roger manerium de Bryanston cum pertinentibus ac aduocationem ecclesie de Bryanston, que de Rege tenentur in capite, et illa ingrediendo licencia regia inde non optenta, causa predicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de xxxv.js. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁸ xvij.li.iiij.s.iiij.d. per Matildam Eueryngham, Priorissam domus monialium Beate Marie de Nunneton et conuentum eiusdem, facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi terras, tenementa, et redditus ad annum valorem xx marcarum vltra reprisas perquirere possent habendos sibi et successoribus suis ad manum mortuam imperpetuum, causa predicta—nihil.

¹ C.P.R. 1446-1452, pp. 263-4 (20 March 1449).

² Ibid. p. 218 (23 February 1449).

³ Ibid. pp. 234-5 (13 May 1449).

⁴ This fine does not appear to have been enrolled : but cf. note 2, p. 395.

⁵ Ibid. p. 232 (22 February 1449).

⁶ Ibid. p. 414 (11 November 1450).

⁷ Ibid. p. 411 (28 February 1451).

⁸ Ibid. p. 500 (2 November 1451).

Nec reddit de xxvj.s.viiij.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ¹ xx marcarum per Ricardum Notyngham, Priorem ecclesie cathedralis Beate Marie de Couentr', et eiusdem loci conventum, facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi ecclesiam de Southam in comitatu Warr', que de aduocacione sua propria existit, appropriare et in proprios vsus tenere possent sibi et successoribus suis causa antedicta—nihil.

Summa pagine—nullum.

fol. 10a

Adhuc aurum Regine

Nec reddit de xxij.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ² xxiiij marcarum per Johannem Marchall', clericum, facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipse et executores sui terras et tenementa annui valoris viij marcarum per annum vltra onera et reprisas, que de Rege non tenentur, dare possit et assignare ad manum imperpetuum, causa predicta—nihil.

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Roberto Constable de consimili auro dicte Regine pertinente de quodam fine³ c marcarum per ipsum in cancellaria Regis facto, pro custodia omnium terrarum et tenementorum que fuerunt Johannis Fastolf de Cowhawe in comitatu Suff' armigeri defuncti habenda vna cum maritagio Thome filij et heredis dicti Johannis—vj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

De xxv.s.iiij.d. de huiusmodi auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁴ xij.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. per Humfridum, Ducem Buk', et Annam vxorem eius, in cancellaria predicta facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi terras tenementa et redditus ad valorem x marcarum per annum dare possent et assignare ad manum imperpetuum hoc anno non reddit, eo quod aliquos denarios inde minime recepit nec recipere potuit per tempus predictum—nihil.

Nec reddit de lxvj.s.viiij.d. de consimili auro prefate Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁵ l marcarum per Ricardum Andreu facto, pro custodia terrarum et heredis Willelmi Frogenhale habenda vna cum maritagio heredis predicti Willelmi causa predicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de liij.s.iiij.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁶ xl. marcarum per Willelmum Lucy, militem, facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipse in omnia castra villas domania maneria terras et tenementa et omnia alia hereditamenta in Anglia Wallia et Marchia Wallie, que post mortem Alianore matris predicti Willelmi ad manus Regis deuenere prefatoque Willelmo descendere reuertere remanere pertinere seu spectare deberent, licite et impune ingredi et seisire et plenam et pacificam seisinam inde capere possit absque aliqua inquisitione inde capienda seu liberacione extra manus Regis proseguenda, causa qua supra—nihil.

¹ C.P.R. 1446-1452, p. 564 (4 July 1452).

² Ibid. p. 524 (7 February 1452).

³ Ibid. p. 144 (15 April 1448). Letters patent vacated because surrendered, the king, on 7 February 31 Henry VI, having appointed Philip Wentworth to the same wardship.

⁴ Ibid. p. 557 (24 May 1452).

⁵ Ibid. p. 305 (23 October 1449). Richard Andrew was the king's secretary (J. Otway-Ruthven, *The King's Secretary in the XVth Century* (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 172-3 for his career).

⁶ C.P.R. 1446-1452, p. 86 (18 August 1447).

Nec reddit de ^{iiij}.li. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ¹ xl.li. per Willelmum Carant, armigerum, facto, pro custodia terrarum et heredis Willelmi Westbury defuncti habenda causa supradicta—[—]nihil.

Nec reddit de denariis receptoris de Johanne, nuper Episcopo Ebor', Geruasio Clifton, armigero, et aliis, de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ² cc.li. per ipsos facto, in cancellaria Regis pro custodia terrarum et heredis Willelmi Horsy habenda vna cum maritagio dicti heredis—[—]xx.li.

De ^{iiij}.li. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ³ xl.li. per Johannem Nanfan armigerum facto pro custodia terrarum et heredis Johannis Trenowith habenda vna cum maritagio eiusdem heredis hoc anno non reddit, eo quod aliquos denarios inde minime recepit nec recipere potuit per tempus predictum—[—]nihil.

Nec reddit de ^{viii}.li.^{xx}.xiii.s.^{iiij}.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁴ ^{iiij}.vi.^{li}.xiii.s.^{iiij}.d. per Thomam Thorp facto, pro custodia omnium terrarum et tenementorum que fuerunt Johannis Helyon defuncti, que per mortem prefati Johannis ac ratione minoris etatis Philippe, vnus filiarum et heredum predicti Johannis, ad manus Regis deuenerunt, habenda vna cum maritagio predictae Philippe, causa predicta—[—]nihil.

Nec reddit de ^{viii}.li.^{xx}.xiii.s.^{iiij}.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam alio fine ⁵ ^{iiij}.vi.^{li}.xiii.s.^{iiij}.d. per dictum Thomam Thorp facto, pro maritagio Isabelle, alterius filiarum et heredum predicti Johannis Helion, ac pro custodia omnium terrarum et tenementorum que ad manus Regis per mortem dicti Johannis et in manibus Regis exstiterunt ratione minoris etatis predictae Isabelle habendis, causa qua supra—[—]nihil.

Nec reddit de xlix.s.^{ix}.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁶ xxiii.^{li}.xvij.s.^{viii}.d. per Johannem Cardinalem et Archiepiscopum Ebor', Thomam Syngleton, et aliis, facto in cancellaria Regis predicta, pro licencia habenda quod fratres et sorores fraternitatis siue gilde gloriose Virginis Marie in ecclesia parochiali de Aylesbury per ipsos pretextu literarum patencium dicti domini Regis fundandis terras et tenementa ad valorem xx.li. per annum perquirere possent ad manum mortuam imperpetuum, causa predicta—[—]nihil.

Summa pagine—[—]xxvj.li.xiii.s.^{iiij}.d.

fol. 10b

Adhuc aurum Regine

Nec reddit de ^{iiij}.li. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁷ xl.li. per Nicholaum Whitbill' vicarium ecclesie parochialis de Chepyngnorton, et

¹ An entry, dated 12 March 1453, in the patent rolls (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 46) cancels letters patent of 23 April, 28 Henry VI, which were not enrolled but are obviously the letters referred to here.

² It looks as if this grant was cancelled, for, on 17 April 1448, Thomas Horsy was taken into the king's hands as his ward (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 187).

³ *Ibid.* p. 51 (12 December 1446).

⁴ Letters patent of 7 December 1453 (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 144) revoked those of 11 February 30 Henry VI, which had nullified those of 5 February, 30 Henry VI, granting to Thomas Thorp the wardship of Philippa and the marriage of Isabel.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *C.P.R., 1446-1452*, p. 412 (12 December 1450).

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 402 (8 October 1450).

alios, in cancellaria Regis facto, pro licencia habenda quod magister siue custos fraternitatis siue gilde de Chepyngnorton terras, tenementa, et redditus ad valorem xl. marcarum per annum perquirere possent ad manum mortuam causa supradicta— nihil.

Nec reddit de xiiij.s.iiij.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ¹ x marcarum per Reginaldum West, dominum de la Ware, facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipse manerium de Alyngton in comitatu Wiltes' et alias terras et tenementa, que de Rege tenentur in capite, dare possit et assignare Johanni Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi et aliis, causa predicta— nihil.

Nec reddit de xl.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ² xx.li. per Thomam Grey, militem, facto, pro maritagio Willelmi filij et heredis Margarete que fuit vxor Thome Grey domini de Richemond defuncti habendo etc, causa qua supra— nihil.

Nec reddit de xx.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ³ x.li. per Ricardum Tunstall facto, pro custodia terrarum et heredis Willelmi Adam defuncti vna cum maritagio heredis predicti Willelmi habendis causa predicta— nihil.

Nec reddit de xx.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁴ x.li. per maiorem et ciues ciuitatis Regis Cicestr', pro confirmacione habenda quorundam priuilegiorum que idem maior et ciues tempore quo non extat memoria habuerunt, causa predicta— nihil.

Nec reddit de xx.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁵ xv.li. per Willelmum Wright et alios in dicta cancellaria Regis facto, pro licencia habenda quod magister et gardiani fraternitatis mistere cissorum ciuitatis Ebor' per ipsos pretextu literarum Regis patencium fundandis acquirere possint terras et tenementa ad valorem c.s. per annum tenendas sibi et successoribus suis ad manum mortuam imperpetuum, causa supradicta— nihil.

Nec reddit de xx.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁶ x.li. per Thomam Chaworth, militem, facto pro licencia habenda quod ipse dare possit et concedere priori et conuentui ecclesie Sancti Johannis Baptiste de Landa et successoribus suis terras et tenementa ad valorem v marcarum per annum ad mortuam imperpetuum causa predicta— nihil.

Nec reddit de xx.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁷ x.li. per priorem et conuentum monachorum Beate Marie de Walsyngham facto, pro confirmacione Regis habenda de certis terris et tenementis in Riburgh et Stibrid', causa predicta— nihil.

Nec reddit de xx.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁸ x.li. per priorem et conuentum monachorum Beate Marie de Thetford facto, pro confirmacione Regis habenda de manerio de Bodney cum pertinentibus, causa predicta— nihil.

¹ This fine does not appear to have been enrolled, p. 311 (19 January 1450).

² *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1445-1452*, p. 256 (12 April 1452).

³ *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1452-1461*, p. 22 (27 January 1453).

⁴ *C.P.R. 1446-1452*, pp. 522-3 (3 September 1451).

⁵ *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 105 (10 February 1453).

⁶ This fine does not appear to have been enrolled ; but cf. note 2, p. 395 and note 1, p. 400.

⁷ *Ibid*, p. 68 (22 March 1453).

⁸ *Ibid*. p. 102 (23 June 1453).

Nec reddit de xxvj.s.viiij.d. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ¹ xx marcarum per priorem et conuentum Sancti Andree Norhampton facto, pro vacacione prioratus predicti per concordiam inter consilium domini Regis et conuentum prioratus predicti xv^o die Februarij anno xxxj^mo habitam, causa predicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de xx.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ² x.li. per Johannem Haryngton et Isabellam vxorem eius facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi et feoffati sui in certis terris et tenementis in Doncastr', Wheteley, et alibi in comitatu Ebor' dare possint et assignare predicta terras et tenementa cuidam capellano perpetuo cantarie sancti Georgij de Doncastr' per ipsos pretexto literarum Regis patencium fundando habenda sibi et successoribus suis ad manum manum mortuam imperpetuum, causa supradicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de xiiij.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ³ vij.li. per Mauricium Berkeley et alios facto, pro pardonacione habenda de transgressione quam fecerunt adquirendo sibi et successoribus suis de Willelmo, nuper domino FitzHugh, manerium de Kyngeston cum pertinentibus in comitatu Not', quod tenet de domino Rege in capite, et illud ingrediendo licencia regia inde non optenta, causa predicta—nihil.

Summa pagine—nullum

fol. 11a

Adhuc aurum Regine

Nec reddit de l.s. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁴ xxv.li. per Hugonem Cardew et Ricardum, Episcopum Sar', et alios facto pro pardonacione habenda de transgressione quam fecerunt adquirendo sibi et heredibus suis de Roulando Lenthale milite defuncto quodam annualem redditum xx.li. quem idem Roulandus nuper habuit ex concessione Regis percipiendum annuatim sibi et heredibus suis de exitibus et proficuis comitatus Heref', causa antedicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de xvj.li. de consimili auro dicte Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁵ cccxl marcarum per abbatem et conuentum monasterij Beate Marie de Ramesey facto, pro licencia habenda quod ipsi maneria terras tenementa redditus et seruicia ad valorem c marcarum per annum vltra reprisas adquirere possint habenda et tenenda sibi et successoribus suis ad manum mortuam imperpetuum, causa predicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de xl.s. de consimili auro prefate Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁶ xx.li. per Willelmum Ingram, canonicum ecclesie cathedralis Beate Marie Sar', facto, pro licencia habenda quod capellanus perpetuus cantarie perpetue Sancti Nicholai in ecclesia Sancti Michelis de Heyworth per ipsum Willelmum pretexto literarum Regis patencium fiendorum terras et tenementa ad valorem x marcarum adquirere possit ad manum mortuam imperpetuum, causa predicta—nihil.

Nec reddit de x.li. de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine ⁷ c.li. per Johannem Penycok, armigerum, facto, pro custodia terrarum et heredis Johannis Legh de Flamston in comitatu Wiltes' defuncti habenda vna cum maritagio heredis predicti Johannis, causa supradicta—nihil.

¹ C.P.R., 1452-61, p. 44 (15 February 1452).

² Ibid. pp. 88-9 (4 July 1453).

⁴ Ibid. p. 34 (15 November 1452).

⁶ Ibid. p. 66 (22 March 1453).

³ Ibid. p. 30 (26 November 1452).

⁵ Ibid. p. 48 (20 March 1453).

⁷ Ibid. p. 37 (4 January 1453).

Nec reddit de iijj.li. de consimili auro dicte Regine pertinente de quodam fine ¹ xl.li. per Edmundum Blake, armigerum, facto, pro custodia omnium terrarum et tenementorum que fuerunt Thome Clifton defuncti habenda vna cum maritagio Roberti filij et heredis predicti Johannis, causa qua supra———nihil.

Nec reddit de iijj.li.ij.s. de consimili auro dicte Regine partinente de quodam fine ² xlj.li. per Johannem Talbot, vicecomitis de Lysle, facto, pro custodia terrarum et heredis Johannis Sandford defuncti habenda vna cum maritagio Ricardi filij et heredis predicti Johannis, causa supredicta———nihil.

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Roberto Godde ³ et plegiis suis de consimili auro Regine pertinente de quodam fine xl. marcarum per ipsum facto, pro quibusdam transgressionibus insurrectionibus et contemptibus vnde iudicatus fuit
———liij.s.iiij.d.

Summa pagine———liij.s.iiij.d.

fol. 11b

Summa totalis recepte

De quibus

(No fair copy of the total is given but at the bottom of the leaf is scribbled the following note of the auditor

Summa totalis recepte vijMDlxij.li.xij.s.jd.)⁴ ~~vijM.Dccxvi.li.xiiij.s.vj.d.ob.q.~~ (sic).

fol. 12a

Feoda militum dominarum et damicellarum infra curiam Regine

Idem computat se soluisse Johanni Wenlok,⁵ camerario prefate Regine, pro feodo suo ad xl.li. per annum, percipiendo terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum per literas dicte Regine de warranto, quarum vna data xxiiij^{to} die Julij anno xxxj^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti et alia date xij^o die Decembris anno eiusdem Regis xxxij^{do} simul cum ij acquietanciis eiusdem inter warranta huius compoti remanent———xl.li.

Et Edwardo Hull' et Andree Ogard',⁶ militibus dapicidis prefate Regine,

¹ C.P.R., 1452-61, p. 30 (28 November 1452).

² Ibid p. 30 (15 December 1452).

³ This fine cannot be traced; but cf. note 2, p. 395 and note 1, p. 400.

⁴ Cf. Introduction, BULLETIN, xl (1957), 81 ff.

⁵ He had already acted as usher of the queen's chamber (C.P.R. 1441-1446, p. 437; C.P.R. 1446-1452, p. 28), though he had become her chamberlain as early as 1448 (ibid. p. 165). The commission dated 8 April 1448 whereby Margaret appointed him to act as her proxy to lay the foundation stone of her college at Cambridge calls him her chamberlain and speaks not only of his circumspection and industry but of his fidelity and uprightness (W. G. Searle, *The History of the Queen's College* (Cambridge 1867), pp. 42-3); yet by July 1455 he had deserted to the Yorkist side (*Rot. Parl.* v. 278).

⁶ Both had already served in the king's household. Hull was already a squire of the body in November 1438 (C.P.R. 1436-1441, p. 232) and a knight by November 1445 (C.P.R. 1441-1446, p. 420). He was already one of the queen's carvers in November 1448 (C.P.R. 1446-1451, p. 210) and was created a Knight of the Garter in 1453 (Shaw, *Knights of England*, i. 13). Ogard, a naturalized Dane, after acting as second chamberlain to the regent Bedford (Stevenson, op. cit. ii. 434), became a king's knight by 1441 (C.P.R. 1441-1446, p. 105), though this did

cuilibet eorum pro feodo suo xl. marcarum per annum, percipiendo terminis predictis equaliter, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum per supradictas duas literas de warranto et iij acquietancias eorundem Edwardi et Andree simul inter warranta predicta remanentes
—liij.li.vj.s.viiij.d.

Et Ismanie, domine de Scalys¹ attendenti circa personam dicte Regine, pro feodo suo ad xl.li. per annum, percipiendo terminis predictis, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus supradictum per supradictas duas literas de warranto simul cum ij acquietancias eiusdem inter warranta predicta remanentes
—xl.li.

Et Isabelle Domine Grey, Domine Margarete Roos, Domine Isabelle Dacre alias Domine Isabelle Butteler,² attendentis circa personam dicte Regine, not prevent him from acting as a member of the Duke of York's council in France in 1443 (Nicolas, op. cit. v. 289) and of his council in England in 1447 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 231). Notwithstanding Ogard's service to the Duke of York, he seems to have won the confidence of Margaret, who is said to have kept his young son and heir, Henry, at her own costs from Andrew's death in 1454 until 1460 (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 583).

¹ Daughter of a Cornishman named Whalesburgh by Jane, daughter of Sir John Raleigh of Nettlecombe, she had married Thomas, Lord Scales, who had distinguished himself in the French wars and in opposing Jack Cade's rebellion, and was to be killed at London in the Lancastrian cause in 1460 (*C.P. xi. 504-7*; *C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 125; *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 478).

² Isabel, Lady Grey had been sent out to France in 1445, along with other ladies of the English court, to escort Margaret to England (B.M. Add. MS. 23, 938, "Compotus Johannis Breknok et Johannis Euerdon de expensis domine Margarete Regine venientis in Anglie"), and her name appears in the lists of recipients of gifts of jewels from the queen in 1445-6, 1446-7, 1448-9, 1451-2, and 1452-3 (E 101/409/14, 17; E 101/410/2, 8, 11); Sir Thomas More identifies her with Queen Elizabeth Wydeville, who was, of course, Lady Elizabeth Grey before her marriage to Edward IV (*Richard III*, ed. J. B. Lumby (1883), p. 59). This identification seems probable but not certain. As G. Smith points out in his *Coronation of Elizabeth Wydeville* (London, 1935), p. 28, there were other ladies named Elizabeth Grey at this time: in addition to the instance which he gives, of Queen Elizabeth's mother-in-law, one may cite particularly the claims of the Elizabeth who in June 1445 was described as "late the wife of Ralph Grey, knight, daily attendant on the queen's person" (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 353).

Lady Margaret Roos was the daughter of Thomas de Ros, Lord Ros. She married William de Botreaux, Lord Botreaux, as his second wife, before 1458 (*C.P. xi. 105*; ii. 242). He died in 1462 but she survived until 1488, having married between 1462 and 1464 Thomas, Lord Burgh.

Lady Isabel was the daughter of Thomas, lord Dacre. In 1454 she married, as his second wife, Sir John Butler or Botiler of Warrington (below, fol. 19b); but in 1458 the marriage was dissolved on the curious grounds that she had already in May 1453 contracted a marriage with Thomas, Lord Clifford, who fell in the first battle of St. Albans in May 1455 and had married Joan Dacre in 1414 (W. Beaumont, *Annals of the Lords of Warrington*, ii. 281 (Chetham Society, 1873)).

videlicet, cuilibet earum pro feodo suo xx.li. per annum percipiendo terminis predictis equaliter, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis per literas de warranto supradictas et vj acquietancias earundem simul inter warranta supradicta remanentes—lx.li.

Et Barbaline,¹ vni damicellarum dicte Regine, pro feodo suo per annum percipiendo terminis predictis, videlicet, pro supradictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus compoti per supradictas duas literas de warranto et ij acquietancias eiusdem simul inter warranta predicta remanentes—

xxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et Rose Merston', Margarete Stanlowe, Katerine Penyson', Katerine Whetyngnam', Agneti Parr, Matilde Lowes, Jamoni Sharneborne, Edithe Burgh', alias Seintelowe, Osan et Alienore Roos² damicellis prefate Regine, pro feodis

¹ Barbelina Herberquyne or Erlebequine, born in Germany, was naturalized in March, 1449 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 240); she had in 1446 been granted an annuity of £40 for good service to the queen (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 445).

² Rose Merston was the wife (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, pp. 109, 339, 481) of John Merston, esquire, who had been treasurer of the king's chamber and keeper of the king's jewels since before 1445 (*Foedera*, v. i. 139) and probably gave up the post during this year, at Easter 1453 (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 293).

Katherine Whetyngnam or Whittingham had married in 1448 (Wedgwood, op. cit. p. 943) Sir Robert Whittingham, usher of the king's chamber from before 1451 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 410) and keeper of the queen's great wardrobe from before April 1458 (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 429). Attainted after Towton (*Rot. Parl.* v. 479a), he went into exile with Margaret in Scotland and France, returned 1471, and died fighting for her at Tewkesbury (Scofield, op. cit. passim; cf. *R.P.* vi. 27b).

Agnes Parr was the wife of Gilbert Parr, who was an esquire for the body and usher of the chamber for the king (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, pp. 84, 401, 429, 431, 547). He was no longer young, for he had been yeoman of the crown to Henry V (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 16). Agnes had been one of those who brought over Margaret from France in 1445 (Stevenson, op. cit. i. 454).

Jamona Sharneborne had married Thomas Sharnebourne or Shernbourne between 1445 and 1447 (C. Munro, *Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou* (Camden Soc., 1863) pp. 107-8). She was Jamona Cherneys or Sharneres, born in the duchy of Anjou, and naturalized in 1449 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, pp. 212, 240). In 1451 Thomas is said to have done good service to the king and queen (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 454). In 1462 a pardon to Jamona Sharnebourne of Sharnebourne, Norfolk, speaks of her as "widow of Thomas Sharnebourne esq., late sheriff, and executive of his will" (Wedgwood, op. cit. p. 764).

Edith Burgh married Giles St. Loo (Seintelowe, Saintlo, Senelowe, etc.) in 1454 (below, fol. 19b). His previous wife, Denise, had died before December 1450 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 435), leaving him properties in Hertfordshire and Middlesex. It will be seen that Giles St. Loo, like Thomas Sharnebourne, served during this financial year 31-32 Henry VI in Margaret's household (below, fol. 12b); Giles was also a king's esquire and he and Edith were granted in 1455 an annuity of 20 marks for their services to the king and queen (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 243).

Osan, or Osanna, was another lady who had come to England with Margaret.

suis cuilibet earum x.li. per annum percipiendis terminis predictis, videlicet, pro dictis ij terminis infra tempus predictum per supradictas ij literas de warranto et xx acquietancias earundem vt supra remanentes——c.li.

Et Johanne Prynce,¹ vni cameriarum prefate Regine, pro feodo suo per annum, percipiendo terminis predictis, videlicet, pro supradictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum per ij literas de warranto supradictas simul cum ij acquietancias eiusdem inter warranta supradicta remanentes——c.s.

Et Johanne Bateresby² alteri camerariarum prefate Regine, pro feodo suo per annum, percipiendo terminis supradictis, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum per ij literas de warranto predictas simul et ij acquietancias eiusdem inter warranta antedicta remanentes——lxvj.s.vij.d.

Summa feodorum militum dominarum et damicellarum infra curiam et hospicium domine Regine——cccxxvij.li.vj.s.vij.d.

fol. 12b

Vadia armigerorum

Et in denariis solutis diuersis armigeris ipsius Regine subscriptis infra curiam suam in singulis officijs existentibus et expectantibus a primo die Octobris anno xxxj^mo dicti Regis Henrici sexti vsque vltimum diem Septembris extunc proxime sequentem cuilibet vij.d.ob.³ per diem dum in officijs suis infra curiam dicte Regine attendentes et finientes vt in rotulis vocatis chekrolles annotati existant vbi omnium armigerorum nomina ac numerus dierum sic seruientium et expectantium singillatim specificantur, per ij literas dicte Regine de warranto quarum vna data xxiiij^{to} die Julij dicto anno xxxj^mo et altera data xij^o die Decembris anno xxxij^{do} eiusdem Regis inter warranta huius compoti remanentes——videlicet

Henrico Bourghchier per xxxv dies——xxj.s.x.d.ob.

Ricardo Drayton per cij dies——lxiiij.s.ix.d.

Egidio Saintlowe per cclvj dies——vij.li.

Thome Sharnbourne per ciiijxvij dies——vj.li.iiij.s.j.d.ob.

Thome Burneby per cccxlvi dies——x.li.xv.s.vij.d.ob.

Born in the Duchy of Burgundy, she was naturalized in 1449 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 240).

As for "Alienore Roos", there was a Lady Eleanor Ros, who was the widow of Thomas, Lord Ros (died 1430) and mother of Lady Margaret Ros, (mentioned above); but this Lady Eleanor had married before 1438 Edmund Beaufort, Earl of Dorset, who was in 1448 created Duke of Somerset. Apart from the fact that this Lady Eleanor would presumably have been anxious to take her second husband's name, her rank, as Duchess and as the daughter of the Earl of Warwick (*C.P.* xi. 104), would have raised her well above the other ladies named in this paragraph. There is no other known "Alienore Roos" who will fit the case.

¹ In the distribution of jewels for 30-31 Henry VI, by the queen's treasurer of the chamber, Prince and Bateresby are grouped with "Joan Clyvers" and "Jacquetta", two "damicellae Regine" not mentioned here (*E* 101/410/11).

² Ibid.

³ This was the standard basis rate of pay for squires in the royal household. Cf. the Black Book of the Household of Edward IV in *Household Ordinances* (London, 1790), p. 45.

Edmundo Clere per ccxlvj dies	vij.li.xiiij.s.ix.d.
Thome Parker per xxxiiij dies	xxj.s.iiij.d.
Thome Saintbarbe per ccxxxvij dies	vij.li.viiij.s.j.d.ob.
Johanni Fetiplace per cclxxiiij dies	vij.li.xj.s.iiij.d.
Roberto Chicheley per ccxxxiiij dies	vij.li.v.s.vij.d.ob.
Waltero Lewkenore per ^{xx} iiij ij dies	lj.s.iiij.d.
Sewar de la Bere per cccv dies	ix.li.x.s.vij.d.ob.
Johanni Bassyngbourne per cxxxvij dies	iiij.li.vj.s.iiij.d.
Henrico Roos per cccix dies	ix.li.xiiij.s.j.d.ob.
Johanni Gilbert per ^{xx} cciiijv dies	viiij.l.xviiij.s.j.d.ob.
Johanni Saintbarbe per clxiiij dies	cj.s.x.d.ob.
Roberto Mounteney per ccxxxix dies	vij.li.ix.s.iiij.d.ob.
Humfrido Stafford per cliij dies	iiij.li.xv.s.vij.d.ob.
Roberto Merefeld per cclvij dies	viiij.li.vij.d.ob.
Johanni Cristemasse per cciiij dies	ix.li.ix.s.iiij.d.ob.
David Lloyd per ccclxv dies	xj.li.viiij.s.j.d.ob.
Roberto Coton per xxxvij dies	xxiiij.s.j.d.ob.
Willelmo Wanneford per xx dies ¹	xij.s.vj.d.

(Summa) cxliiiij.li.iiij.s.iiij.d.ob.

Vadia clericorum infra hospicium Regine

Et Willelmo Crosseley, clerico closette Regine, ² pro vadiis suis ad iiij.d.ob. per diem per ccxlvj dies _____ vj.li.ix.s.ix.d.

Et Georgio Assheby, clerico signeti Regine ³ pro feodo suo per annum

¹ Some of these squires had already had experience of service as squires in the royal household ; e.g. Edmund Clere, who is described as a king's esquire as early as January 1444 (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 229) and wrote to tell Sir John Paston about Henry VI's recovery of his wits in January 1455 (*Paston Letters*, i. 314-16). Some of these squires subsequently showed devotion to Margaret's cause ; e.g. Henry Roos, son and heir of Sir Robert Roos (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 276), who was one of the king's carvers (E 101/409/11, fol. 33a), was one of those who fled with Margaret to Scotland after Towton (*Paston Letters*, ii. 46). (Henry Bourchier is not an example of desertion ; for the Henry Bourchier who was made Earl of Essex by Edward IV was already Viscount Bourchier by 1446 (*C.P. v. 137*)). David Lloyd is of especial interest to the student of fifteenth-century ranks, for though in March 1444 he was still only one of the master-cooks of the royal household, he is described as a king's esquire (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 259) ; and he remained a king's esquire in September 1445 when he was already the queen's master-cook (*ibid.* p. 374). Some of these men served as members of parliament sooner or later, and information about them may therefore be found in Wedgwood, *Biographies*.

² The sole surviving account of Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's household (E 36/207) includes no record of payment to a clerk of the queen's closet.

³ Queen Elizabeth's clerk of the signet was paid a fee of only £4 a year (E 36/207, p. 19). George Ashby was a clerk of the signet to the king as early as 1438—(*C.P.R. 1436-1441*, p. 177)—but not from 1422, as stated in *D.N.B.*—and was

percipiendo terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter, videlicet pro eisdem terminis infra tempus predictum accidentis—vj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et Jacobo Fynaunce,¹ clerico jocalium prefate Regine, pro feodo suo ad vj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. per annum percipiendo terminis predictis equaliter, videlicet de huiusmodi feodo suo a vij^o die Marcij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} vsque festum Sancti Michelis extunc proxime sequentem, scilicet per dimidium anni et xxv dies iuxta ratam feodi predicti per idem tempus—lxxv.s.ix.d.ob.

fol. 13a

Vadia valletorum

Et in denariis solutis diuersis valettis ipsius Regine subscriptis existentibus et expectancibus infra curiam suam in singulis officiis suis a predicto primo die Octobris dicto anno xxxj^{mo} vsque vltimum diem Septembris anno xxxij^{do} supradicto, cuilibet iij.d. per diem² dum in officiis suis infra curiam dicte Regine attendentes et seruientes vt in predictis rotulis vocatis chekrolles annotati existant per supradictas literas de warranto vt supra remanentes—videlicet—

Ricardo Elenedon per v dies—xv.d.

Roberto Sauage per ^{xx}ciiijxij dies—xlviiij.s.

Willelmo Lepton per ^{xx}cciiijvj dies—lxxj.s.vj.d.

Thome Babham per ccxx dies—lv.s.

Samps' Vykers per cccxxij dies—iiij.li.ix.d.

Roberto Catton per ^{xx}ciiijxviij dies—xlix.s.vj.d.

Radulfo Gamage per ccclx dies—iiij.li.x.s.

Johanni Weston per ccclxij dies—iiij.li.x.s.vj.d.

Humfrido Whitgrene per ccc dies—lxxv.s.

Henrico Cripsheld per ccclxv dies—iiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d.

Micheli Belwell per ccclxv dies—iiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d.

Thome Vaus per cccxviij dies—lxxix.s.vj.d.

Willelmo Burton per ^{xx}ciiijxij dies—xlviiij.s.

made clerk of the queen's signet in 1445 (Wedgwood, *Biographies*, p. 22). He had also been writer to the signet to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (A Prisoner's Reflections, line 61, in *George Ashby's Poems*, ed. M. Bateson (E.E.T.S., Extra Series, 1899), p. 3). In his "Active Policy of a Prince" Ashby advises Edward, Prince of Wales, Margaret's son, on the choice of a secretary and other household servants (ibid. pp. 27-8), doubtless drawing on his experience in the queen's as well as the king's household. His grandson was a clerk of the signet to Henry VII (*Letters and Papers of Richard III and Henry VII*, ed. J. Gairdner (Rolls Series, 1863), ii. 90). For his writings see *D.N.B.* and *Cambridge Bibliography of Engl. Lit.* i. 253; for his career see Wedgwood, *Biographies*, p. 22.

¹ Cf. *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 507 for grant, dated 7 July 1459, to John Besynbe, yeoman of the Crown, of all lands late of Agnes Fynawns, late wife of James Fynawns, to hold during minority of John, her son and heir. That clerks such as James Fynaunce could marry is shown by George Ashby's case (*Cal. Papal Registers, 1447-1455*, p. 681 and *D.N.B.*).

² This was the standard rate of pay for yeomen in the king's household (*Household Ordinances*, p. 38).

Thome Mouseherst per ciiijxij dies	xxxvij.s.
Georgeo Dale per ccclxv dies	iiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d.
Johanni Sergeaunt per clj dies	xxxvij.s.ix.d.
Edmundo Bolton per ccclviij dies	iiij.li.ix.s.vj.d.
Johanni Wyke per cccxxviij dies	iiij.li.iiij.s.vj.d.
Johanni Bere per cccxxiiij dies	iiij.li.xij.d.
Johanni Traile per ccvj dies	lxxvj.s.vj.d.
Roberto Gray per ccxxiiij dies	lviiij.s.iiij.d.
Galfrido Wright per ccxviij dies	lxxix.s.iiij.d.
Thome Brown per cxlvij dies	xxxvj.s.ix.d.
Johanni Scoriar per cccxxij dies	iiij.li.iiij.s.
Johanni Hill per ccvj dies	lxxvj.s.
Johanni Braughyng per ccxlvij dies	iiij.li.vj.s.ix.d.
Roberto Aleigh per cccxlij dies ¹	iiij.li.v.s.vj.d.
(Summa)	iiijxiiij.li.xv.s.vj.d.

Willelmo Fawkener, herbigeour ² Regine, ad c.s. per annum percipiendos ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis, videlicet, pro terminis predictis infra dictum tempus huius compoti per literas de warranto supradictas c.s.

Johanni Skynner, valetto de la scaldynghous, ³ ad xl.s. per annum percipiendos ad terminos predictos equaliter, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra tempus predictum per eandem literas de warranto xl.s.

Willelmo Barnet, valletto pulletrie ⁴ capienti per diem iij.d. tam infra hospicium quam extra a supradicto primo die Octobris anno xxxj^{mo} vsque vltimum diem mensis Septembris tunc proxime sequentem per ccclxv dies per literas predictas iiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d.

Johanni Browe, ⁵ valetto de cateria, pro vadiis suis ad vd. ob. tam infra

¹ Many of these yeomen had held, or still held, posts in the king's household. Thus, William Lepton, Thomas Babham, and Thomas Vaus had been named as yeomen of the crown (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 509; *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 392); John Traile was in 1455 a purveyor to the royal household (*ibid.* p. 194); and when Michael Belwell had been naturalized, in 1443, he had been described as "valettus ac sirurgicus noster" (*Foedera*, v. i. 117).

For letters from Margaret on behalf of Thomas Burneby, sewer to the queen's mouth, and Thomas Mouseherst, king's serjeant, who was in 1446 groom of the queen's chamber (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 437), see Munro, *op. cit.* pp. 97, 151. For details of Humphrey Whitgreue, a Duchy of Lancaster official, see *BULLETIN*, xl (1957), 100, n. 6.

² Herbigeour means harbinger, the official who was responsible for securing lodgings for members of the queen's household as they toured about the country.

³ The scaldinghouse dressed poultry supplied by the office of poultry, ready for the cook (*Household Ordinances*, pp. 237-8).

⁴ William Barnet was also frequently employed as a purveyor of poultry to the king's household (e.g. *C.P.R. 1446-1452*, pp. 63, 125, 228, 324, 400; *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, pp. 22, 141, 194, 387, 388, 462, 525).

⁵ John Browe was by 1457 described as "esquire", and in 1458 was yeoman of the catery in the king's household (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, pp. 403, 387). If he is to be

hospicium quam extra a supradicto primo die Octobris anno xxxj^{mo} vsque vltimum diem mensis Septembris tunc proxime sequentis, scilicet, per ccclxv dies per easdem literas—viiij.li.vij.s.iiij.d.ob.

Marione Lauender pro feodo suo per annum percipiendi terminis supradictis equaliter, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra dictum tempus huius compoti accidentibus per literas de warranto supradictas—xl.s.

fol. 13b

Vadia garcionum

Et in denariis solutis diuersis garcionibus ipsius Regine subscriptis infra curiam suam in singulis officiis suis existentibus et expectantibus a dicto primo die Octobris dicto anno xxxj^{mo} vsque vltimum diem Septembris anno xxxij^{do} supradicto per supradictas duas literas de warranto vt supra remanentes videlicet

Ricardo Medewe, garcione robarum Regine	} videlicet, cuilibet eorum pro terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus compoti xiiij.s. iiij.d. de feodo et liij.s. iiij.d. de regardo— xxx.li.
Johanni Steuens, garcione lectorum	
Thome Eyr, garcione camere	
Ricardo Bircheley, garcione camere	
Edwardo Hesketh, garcione camere	
Johanni Turges, garcione camere	
Ade Salley, garcione camere	
Roberto Wadenyng, garcione camere	
Rogero Otteley, garcione camere	

Ricardo Frewey, garcione camere Regine, pro huiusmodi feodo et regardo suis a supradicto primo die Octobris anno xxxj^{mo} vsque finem Pasche extunc proxime sequentis, scilicet, per dimidium annum per supradictam literam de warranto datum xxiiij^{to} die Julij eodem anno xxxj^{mo} vt supra remanentem—xxxiiij.s.iiij.d.

Radulfo Bere, garcione camere prefate Regine, pro consimili feodo et regardo suis a xx^{mo} die Maij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} vsque vltimum diem Septembris tunc proxime sequentis, scilicet, per cxxxiiij dies, iuxta ratam feodi et regardi predictorum per idem tempus per supradictam literam de warranto datam xij^o die Decembris supradicto anno xxxij^{do} remanentem vt supra—xxiiij.s.iiij.d.ob.

Ricardo Jonet garcione, paynmaynbaker Regine	} videlicet, cuilibet eorum pro supradictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum xiiij.s.iiij.d. de feodo et xl.s. de regardo xxxij.li.
Galfrido Loveles	
Petro Marchall' } garcionibus cellarie	
Willelmo Heron	
Galfrido Willyam } garcionibus coquine	
Thome Wadelove, garcione lardarie	
Ricardo Lowesdale, garcione squillerie	
Roberto Feriby, garcione aquarie	
Willelmo Pepir, garcione lavendrie	
Johanni Roche, garcione estuffure	
Ricardo Bede, garcione pulletrie	
Thome Saundres, garcione elemosinarie ¹	

identified with John Brown, he had been earlier yeoman of the poultry and under-clerk of the kitchen in the king's household (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, pp. 4, 372, 373).

¹ Many of the grooms, like the yeomen, had served in the royal household, e.g. Thomas Eyre (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 433); Richard Bircheley (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 510); John Turges, who was harper to Queen Margaret (*ibid.*, pp. 250, 512);

Radulfo Bere, garcione panetrie, pro huiusmodi feodo et regardo suis a predicto primo Octobris anno xxxj^{mo} vsque festum Pasche tunc proxime sequentem, scilicet, per dimidium annum per supradictam literam de warranto datam xxiiij^{to} die Julij eodem anno xxxj^{mo} inter warranta supradicta remanentem
—xxvj.s.viiij.d.

Johanni Baret, garcione panetrie, pro consimili feodo et regardo suis a supradicto festo Pasche anno xxxj^{mo} vsque festum Sancti Michelis extunc proxime sequentem, scilicet, per dimidium annum per supradictam literam de warranto datam xij^o die Decembris dicto anno xxxij^{do} vt supra remanentem
—xxvj.s.viiij.d.

fol. 14a

Vadia pagetorum

Et in denariis solutis diuersis pagettis dicte Regine subscriptis infra curiam suam in singulis officiis suis existentibus et expectancibus a dicto primo die Octobris anno xxxj^{mo} dictim Henrici sexti vsque vltimum diem Septembris anno eiusdem Regis xxxij^{do} per supradictas duas literas de warranto—videlicet—

Rogero Euerdon, ¹ pagetto robarum Regine	{	videlicet, vtrique eorum pro terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum vj.s. viiij.d. de feodo et xxxij.s.iiij.d. de regardo—iiij.li.
Roberto Quykerell, pagetto camere Regine		
Johanni Mathewe, pagetto lectorum Regine	{	videlicet, vtrique eorum pro consimili feodo et regardo suis pro termino Pasche infra tempus pre- dictum—xl.s.
Willelmo Wenham, pagetto camere		
Johanni Sergeaunt, pagetto lectorum Regine	{	videlicet, vtrique eorum pro consimili feodo et regardo suis pro termino Michelis infra tempus huius compoti—xl.s.
Johanni Felder, pagetto camere Regine		
Johanni Bene, pagetto paynmaynbaker	{	videlicet, cuilibet eorum vj.s. viiij.d. de feodo et xxvj.s.viiij.d. de regardo pro terminis pre- dictis infra tempus predictum —xv.li.
Johanni Groue, pagetto coquine		
Hugone Johnson, pagetto coquine		
Willelmo Brown, pagetto pulletrie		
Roberto Lichfeld, pagetto de la scaldyng hous		
Willelmo Bony, pagetto squillarie		
Thome Pauer, pagetto ewerie		
Ricardo Brynkeley, pagetto wafferie		
Waltero Phelipp, pagetto lauendrie		

Geoffrey Lovelace (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, pp. 478, 577) ; Geoffrey William (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, pp. 31, 44, 210).

¹ The grant to Roger Everdon of the parkership of Chaddesley and Walsall in 1446 (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 433) is typical of the energy displayed and the success achieved by Queen Margaret in securing rewards for her servants and friends. In the same week grants of offices were obtained for four more of her household servants (*ibid.* p. 433).

Johanni Baret, pagetto panterie, pro consimili feodo et regardo suis a supradicto primo die Octobris anno xxxj^{mo} vsque festum Pasche extunc proxime sequentem, scilicet per dimidium annum ————— xvj.s.viiij.d.

Johanni Wadnyng, pagetto panetrie, pro consimili feodo et regardo suis a supradicto festo Pasche dicto anno xxxj^{mo} vsque Sancti Michelis tunc proxime sequentem, scilicet per dimidium annum ————— xvj.s.viiij.d.
Summa vadiorum armigerorum, clericorum, valettorum, gacionum, et pagetorum infra hospicium dicte Regine cum regardis eorundem ————— ccclxix.li.xix.d.

fol. 14b

Feoda et vadia officiariorum Regine extra hospicium

Et Johanni, Vicecomiti Beaumont,¹ consanguineo prefate Regine, quem eadem Regina ordinavit, constituit, et fecit capitalem senescallum suum omnium castrorum, diuersorum maneriorum, terrarum, et tenementorum, que prefata Regina habet vel habere poterit in Anglia, Wallia, et Marchia Wallie, habendum et occupandum officium illud per se vel sufficientem deputatum suum quamdiu se bene et fideliter gesserit in eodem officio, percipiendum annuatim de prefata Regina pro officio predicto c marcas legalis monete Anglie, per manus receptoris generalis eiusdem Regine pro tempore existentis, per literas ipsius Regine patentes datas xvj^o die Marcij anno xxx^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti penes ipsum remanentes, videlicet, de huiusmodi feodo suo hoc anno ac per acquietanciam dicti vicecomitis inter warranta huius compoti remanentem ————— lxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et in feodo magistri Laurencij Bothe,² clerici, quem supradicta Margareta Regina ordinavit, fecit, et constituit cancellarium suum, habendum et occupandum illud officium quamdiu idem Laurencius se bene gesserit in officio predicto cum omnimodis feodis, vadiis, et proficuis dicto officio debitis et consuetis, percipiendis annuatim per manus receptoris generalis eiusdem Regine pro tempore existentis ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter, per literas eiusdem Regine patentes datas vij^o die Marcij anno xxix^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti penes ipsum remanentes, videlicet, de huiusmodi feodo suo pro terminis predictis infra tempus predictum et prout allocatum est consimilibus in compotis precedentibus ac per acquietanciam eiusdem magistri Laurencij inter warranta predicta remanentem ————— xl.li.

Et eidem magistro Laurencio Bothe, clerico, cancellario prefate Regine pro hospicio suo in Londonia, per literas dicte Regine de warranto datas vij^o die Junij anno xxx^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti et inter warranta de eodem anno remanentes, per quas quidem literas eadem Regina inter alia voluit et prefato receptore suo generali mandavit quod annuatim eidem cancellario suo solueret x.li. pro dicto hospicio suo in Londonia et vj.s.viiij.d. per diem quando ipse equitauerit pro expeditione alicuius materij (sic) prefate Regine incumbentis siue pertinentis eisdem modo et forma, prout Johannes Wodehous, nuper cancellarius Katerine nuper Regine Anglie, de eadem Regina habuit et percepit et prout

¹ As is well known, he was the first viscount in English history. Constable of England 1445-50, Great Chamberlain, 1450, he was appointed chamberlain to the queen on 16 March 1452 (Somerville, op. cit. p. 209). He was slain in 1460 at the Battle of Northampton fighting on the Lancastrian side (C.P. ii. 62).

² For his career see BULLETIN, xl (1957), 92-3; D.N.B.; and A. H. Thompson, in *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*, tome 9, col. 1164.

hujusmodi allocacio facta fuit eidem Johanni Wodehous in compoto Thome Rokes,¹ nuper receptoris generalis prefate Katerine nuper Regine, de anno (sic) eiusdem regis Henrici sexti—x.li.

Et eidem cancellario pro vadiis equitantis de Londonia vsque Wyndesoram mensibus Decembris et Januarij supradicto anno xxxij^do regis Henrici sexti per diuersas vices ex mandato dicte Regine pro diuersis materijs commodum dicte Regine tangentibus, scilicet, eundo morando et redeundo per ix dies, capienti per diem vj.s.viii.d. per supradictas literas de warranto in proxima particula precedenti annotatas ac per billam ipsius camerarij inter warranta huius compoti remanentem—lx.s.

fol. 15a

Adhuc feodo et vadia officiariorum Regine extra hospicium

Et in feodo Willelmi Cotton² armigeri generalis receptoris omnium castrorum honorum, annuitatum, reuencuum, terrarum, et tenementorum suorum, ac aliarum commoditatum quaruncumque eidem Regine pertinentium et in manibus suis existentium et que in manibus eiusdem Regine imposterum devenirint quamdiu idem Willelmus erga prefatam Reginam se bene et fideliter gesserit, habendum et occupandum officium predictum cum feodis, vadiis, et proficiis eidem officio debitis et consuetis, per literas patentes dicte Regine datas xix^mo die Julij anno xxiiij^{to} dicti Regis Henrici sexti superius in titulo huius compoti allegatas necnon per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas dicto xix^{no} die Aprilis anno dicti Regis xxv^{to} auditoribus suis directas inter warranta de eodem anno xxv^{to} remanentes—l.li.

Et eidem Willelmo de regardo sibi facto per prefatam Reginam vltra predictas l.li per annum, causa officij supradicti pro hospicio suo et mora sua Londonie per literam de warranto remanentem vt supra—x.li.

Et eidem Willelmo pro vadiis suis equitantis de domo sua propria in comitatu Suff' vsque Londoniam pro denariis recipiendis et diuersis materijs prefate Regine cum alijs de magno consilio suo communicandis et post quemlibet terminum de Londonia vsque domum suam propriam eundo et redeundo in quolibet termino per iiij dies, videlicet terminis Sancti Michelis, Sancti Hillarij, Pasche, et Sancte Trinitatis infra tempus compoti, capiendo per diem v.s.—iiij.li.

Et eidem Willelmo pro vadiis suis equitantis de Landewade in comitatu Cantebrigie vsque Royston mense Maij predicto anno xxxj^mo cum moneta Johanni Hattecliff,³ clerico avenarij prefate Regine, super expensis officij sui liberanda et deinde vsque Walsyngham cum moneta prefate Regine super priuatis expensis camere sue liberanda, eundo morando et redeundo per viij dies ac equitantis de Landewade predicta vsque Walden mense Augusti supradicto xxxij^do pro colloquio habendo cum senescallo auditore et ceteris ministris Regine

¹ It was evidently common practice in the queen's household to quote such a precedent. See Introduction BULLETIN, xl (1957), 90, n. 5. Rokes was in 1454 a clerk of the greencloth in the king's household (Nicolas, op. cit. vi. 226).

² For his biography see Somerville, op. cit. p. 399.

³ Possibly a kinsman of the well-known and important William Hattecliffe, later to be physician and secretary to Edward IV; for William Hattecliffe was not only one of Henry VI's doctors (C.P.R. 1452-1461, pp. 26, 147, 195, 235) but was also physician to Queen Margaret (ibid. pp. 195, 339).

ibidem pro renouacione rentalis eiusdem manerij, eundo morando et redeundo per ij vices vtraque vice per iij dies, necnon equitantis de Landewade predicta vsque Wyndesoram mense Januarij anno predicto ac de ibidem vsque Londoniam et deinde iterato vsque Wyndesoram predictam pro moneta dicte Regine super priuatis expensis camere sue ac custodia iocalium eiusdem Regine super expensis officij sui liberanda, eundo morando et redeundo per xij dies in toto per xxvj dies, capienti per diem vt supra—vj.li.x.s.

Et in feodo Roberti Tanfeld,¹ generalis attornati dicte Regine, ad proseguenda et defendenda omnimoda placita, querela, mota seu mouenda pro predicta Regina vel contra Reginam in omnibus curiis Regis, et ad lucrandum et perdendum in eisdem et ad facienda et ordinanda omnimoda breuia de execucione vel aliter Reginam tangencia in scaccario Regis, et ad essendum clericum dictorum breuium ibidem, habendo et occupando quamdiu dicte Regine placuerit, percipiendo annuatim x.li. sterlingorum ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis per manus receptoris generalis sui per literas dicte Regine patentes datas sexto die Julij anno xxiiij^{to} dicti Regis Henrici sexti et acquietanciam eiusdem inter warranta huius compoti remanentem.

fol. 15b

Adhuc feoda officiariorum Regine extra hospicium

Et in vadijs diurnis dicti Roberti Tanfeld, generalis attornati Regine, morantis Londonie ante principium termini Pasche supradicto anno xxxj^{mo} pro diuersis materijs Regine Suthampton et Pembroke tangentibus a xiiij^o die Aprilis eodem anno vsque xviiij^{mo} diem eiusdem mensis per iij dies et vltra finem termini pro diuersis materijs Regine partes predictas tangencibus a xij^o die Maij anno predicto vsque sextum diem Junij extunc proxime sequentem per xxiiij dies ac ibidem morantis vltra finem termini Sancte Trinitatis pro exemplificacione actus de Suthampton et Pembroke et literis patentibus de libertatibus Regine proseguendis et pro liberacione habenda in cancellaria Regis de manerio de Fekenham ac pro quadam materia domine de Dacres ex mandato Regine ab xj^{mo} die Julij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} vsque vltimum diem eiusdem mensis per xix dies necnon ibidem morantis vltra finem termini Sancti Michelis cum aliis de consilio Regine, tam pro diuersis materijs eiusdem Regine coram consilio domini Regis quam in scaccario et ad recepta eiusdem proseguendis a xxix^{no} die Nouembris supradicto anno xxxij^{do} vsque xix diem Decembris extunc proxime sequentem per xx dies et ibidem morantis vltra finem termini Sancti Hillarij eodem anno pro diuersis materijs dicte Regine in parlamento ibidem existentibus et pro aliis materijs eiusdem Regine necessariis proseguendis a xij^o die Februarij dicto anno xxxij^{do} vsque xiiij^o Aprilis die extunc proxime sequenti per lx dies, in toto per cxxvii dies, capientis per diem iij.s.iiij.d. per billam ipsius Roberti inter warranta huius compoti remanentem—xxj.li.vj.s.viiij.d.

Et in feodo Johannis Walssh et Nicholai Sharp,² auditorum, receptorum, balliuorum, feodarium, prepositorum, et aliorum ministrorum seu officiariorum

¹ For his biography see Wedgwood, op. cit. pp. 840-1. Tanfield succeeded Cotton in 1455 as chamberlain to Queen Margaret (Somerville, op. cit. p. 209).

² Walsh and Sharp were both auditors of the Duchy of Lancaster. For their biographies see Somerville, op. cit. pp. 399-400, 439-40. Sharp succeeded Cotton as receiver-general of the Duchy (ibid. p. 209). They not only audited

quorumcumque, in Anglia, Wallia, et Marchijs, eiusdem prefate Regine computabilem, percipiendo per manus receptoris generalis pro tempore existentis pro determinacione huiusmodi compotorum per annum per commissionem suam die anno (sic) xxiiij^{to} dicti Regis Henrici sexti penes ipsos remanentem—x.li.

Et in vadijs dicti Johannis Walssh pro equitacionibus suis in officio auditoris circa capcionem et determinacionem compotorum ministrorum et receptorum, necnon receptoris generalis, magistri iocalium, clerici auenarie, clerici operacionum manerij de Pleasaunce, ac aliorum officiarum et ministrorum Regine quorumcumque determinandis hoc anno per billam inde inter memoranda huius compoti remanentem—xxx.li.xvj.s.viiij.d.

Et in vadijs eiusdem Johannis pro equitacionibus suis in officio suo predicto circa capcionem et determinacionem compotorum ministrorum et receptorum de Tuttebury, Leye, et Kenelworth hoc anno per xl dies per billam remanentem vt supra—vj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et in vadijs dicti Nicholai Sharp pro equitacionibus suis in officio auditoris circa capcionem et determinacionem compotorum ministrorum ac receptorum, necnon receptoris generalis magistri iocalium, clerici auenarie, clerici operacionum manerij de Pleasaunce, et aliorum officiariorum et ministrorum Regine quorumcumque determinandis hoc anno, per billam inde inter memoranda supradicta remanentem—viiij.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et solutis dictis Johanni Walssh et Nicholao Sharp pro valoribus omnium domaniorum maneriorum terrarum et tenementorum dicte Regine extrahendis et compilandis ac ingrossandis de regardo eis facto pro eodem—liij.s.iiij.d.

fol. 16a

Adhuc feoda et vadia officiariorum Regine extra hospicium

Et solutis Ricardo Croke, clerico registrarum cancellarie Regine ad c.s. per annum ¹ pro feodo suo ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra tempus predictum per literam dicte Regine de warranto datam septimo die Februarij supradicto anno xxxij^{do} inter warranta huius compoti remanentem—c.s.

Et Willelmo Nanseglos ² clerico recepte Regine scribenti rotulum feodorum militum, indenturas, acquietancias, obligaciones, et alia diuersa memoranda officium receptoris generalis tangentia, pro feodo suo per annum per eandem literam de warranto vt supra remanentem—c.s.

Et in feodo Johannis Vailard attornati Regine in cancellaria domini Regis terminos predictos, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra tempus predictum per

the queen's household accounts but some of the king's as well (e.g. *C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 60 ; *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 293).

¹ Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's clerk of the registers, Alexander Rowton, should also have received 100s, but it was disallowed "mandato domine Regine" (*E 36/207*, p. 24). The fee of Elizabeth's clerk of the receipt, Thomas Holbache, was also disallowed.

² Also receiver of the queen's revenues from Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, and London (above, fol. 12b). He was one of the executors of the will of William Cotton (*D.L. 28/5/9*).

dictam literam de warranto et acquietanciam eiusdem simul vt supra remanentem
—xl.s.

Et in feodo Thome Lloid attornato dicte Regine in Banco Regis ad xl.s. per annum ad terminos predictos, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra tempus predictum per predictam literam de warranto et acquietanciam eiusdem simul vt supra remanentem—xl.s.

Et Simoni Elleryngton, attornato dicte Regine in communi Banco Regis, pro feodo suo per annum ad terminos predictos, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra tempus predictum per supradictam literam de warranto ac acquietanciam eiusdem Simonis simul inter warranta predicta remanentem—xl.s.

Et Willelmo Essex et Johanni Croke, attornatis dicte Regine in scaccario domini Regis,¹ ad c.s. per annum pro eorum feodo a festo Sancti Michelis anno xxix^{no} dicti Regis Henrici sexti vsque idem festum Sancti Michelis anno eiusdem Regis xxxij^{do} per iij annos integras per literam ipsius Regine de warranto datam xxij^o die Februarij supradicto anno xxxij^{do} necnon acquietanciam eorundem simul inter warranta supradicta remanentem—xv.li.

Et solutis Radulfo Poole, Roberto Danby, Waltero Moile, Thome Billyng, et Johanni Nedeham,² apprenticiis ad legem retentis cum dicta Regina de consilio, cuilibet eorum, pro feodo suo xxvj.s.vijj.d. per annum, percipiendo ad terminos predictos per supradictam literam de warranto datam vij^o die Februarij dicto anno xxxij^o, scilicet, pro terminis predictis infra tempus predictum—x.li.

Et solutis Willelmo Randolf,³ hostiario domus magni consilij, xx.s., et septem alijs hostiarijs tam scaccarij domini Regis quam recepte eiusdem scaccarij, xxij.s.iiij.d., de quodam regardo sibi facto pro eorum attendencia consilio prefate Regine in officijs suis per supradictam literam de warranto remanentem vt supra
—xliij.s.iiij.d.

Et in vadijs Johannis Sharp, custodis magni gardini manerij de Pleasaunce, ad vj.d. per diem sibi concessis, habendis et occupandis durante beneplacito dicte Regine, percipiendis annuatim ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis per manus receptoris generalis pro tempore, per literas dicte Regine patentes datas xxvij^o die Julij anno xxv^{to} dicti Regis Henrici vj^{ti} penes ipsum remanentes, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum ac per acquietanciam eiusdem Johannis inter warranta huius compoti remanentem—
ix.li.ij.s.vj.d.

Et in vadijs Johannis Russhewe, custodis parvi gardini subtus fenestras

¹ They also represented the Duchy of Lancaster in the royal exchequer (Somerville, op. cit. p. 458).

² Danby, Moyle, and Billing were also retained by the Duchy of Lancaster (Somerville, op. cit. p. 451). All five eventually became judges—Poole or Pole was made justice of the king's bench in 1452, Danby became chief justice of the common pleas in 1461, Moyle and Needham were created justices of the same court in 1454 and 1457, Billing rose to be chief justice of the king's bench in 1469 (E. Foss, *The Judges of England*, iv. 353, 426, 447, 415).

³ Cf. *C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 149 for grant for life on 8 February 1448 to John Randolf "of the keeping of the council-chamber within the palace of Westminster and of the office of usher of the Receipt of the Exchequer". Cf. *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1445-1452*, pp. 208, 253, which seems to confirm the impression that "William" is a mistake for John.

camerarie dicti manerij de Pleasaunce, ad ij.d. per diem sic sibi per dictam Reginam concessis, habendis et occupandis durante beneplacito dicte Regine, percipiendis annuatim per manus receptoris generalis pro tempore existentis ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter, per literas dicte Regine patentes datas xxvij^o die Julij anno xxvj^{to} dicti Regis Henrici sexti penes ipsum remanentes, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum et per acquietanciam eiusdem Johannis inter warranta supradicta remanentem

lx.s.x.d.

fol. 16b

Adhuc feoda et vadia officiariorum Regine extra hospicium

Et in vadiis Roberti Ketilwell, cui dicta Regina concessit officium clerici operacionum manerij sui de Pleasaunce in comitatu Kancie,¹ habendum et occupandum dictum officium a festo Sancti Michelis anno xxvj^{to} dicti Regis Henrici sexti quamdiu sibi placuerit, percipiendis in eodem officio iij.d. per diem de exitibus et reuencibus dotis eiusdem Regine per manus generalis receptoris sui pro tempore existentis cum consimili vestura prout alij clerici de suo gradu in hospicio Regine percipient, percipiendis in magna garderoba Regine per manus custodis eiusdem, per literas eiusdem Regine patentes datas xj^{mo} die Maij dicto anno xxvj^{to} penes ipsum remanentes, videlicet, in persolucionem vadorum predictorum hoc anno ac per acquietanciam eiusdem Roberti inter warranta huius compoti remanentem

vj.li.xx.d.

Et in vadiis Johannis Claydon,² cui dicta Regina concessit officium custodis parci sui de Grenewyche et turris sui infra dictum parcum, habendum et occupandum dictum officium a decimo die Septembris anno xxix^{no} dicti Regis Henrici sexti per se vel sufficientem deputatum suum quamdiu eidem Regine placuerit cum vadio vnus denarij per diem, percipiendis annuatim per manus receptoris generalis eiusdem Regine pro tempore existentis ad terminos Sancti Michelis et Pasche per equales porciones ac cum aliis feodis et proficuis eidem officio iuste debitis et consuetis, per literas ipsius Regine patentes datas xj^{mo} die Maij anno dicti Regis xxx^{mo} penes ipsum remanentes, videlicet, in persolucionem huiusmodi vadorum suorum hoc anno pro terminis predictis infra tempus predictum ac per acquietanciam eiusdem Johannis inter warranta supradicta remanentem

xxx.s.v.d.

Et in feodo siue vadiis Rogeri Morecroft,³ quem dicta Regina constituit et ordinauit nuncium pro consilio suo ac hostiarium et custodem noui turris apud Westmonasterium iuxta scaccarium domini Regis prefate Regine assignati, tam pro consilio suo quam pro conseruacione et salua custodia euidentiarum et librorum eiusdem Regine, habendum et occupandum dicta officia quamdiu eidem Regine

¹ For his account as clerks of the works of the manor of Pleasance at Gravesend, from Easter 25 Henry VI until Michaelmas, 35 Henry VI, see D.L. 28/1/11.

² Possibly the same John Clayton who was in 1441 a page of the king's buttery, in 1445 a page of the king's cellar, and in 1446, when he was made joint keeper of Fanhope park, described as "of the king's cellar" (C.P.R. 1441-1446, pp. 55, 335, 433). He had become a groom of the king's cellar by 1454 (Nicolas, op. cit. vi. 227).

³ See Introduction, BULLETIN, xl (1957), 95, n. 7.

placuerit cum omnimodis feodis vadiis et proficuis dictis officiis debitis et consuetis temporibus aliarum Reginarum per literas dicte Regine patentes datas xij^o die Januarij anno xxix^{no} dicti Regis Henrici vj^{ti} ac per literas dicte Regine de warranto datas xx^{mo} die Marcij dicto anno xxix^{no} inter warranta de anno xxx^{mo} eiusdem Regis remanentes, per quas quidem literas eadem Regina voluit et eidem receptori suo generali mandauit quod soluat eidem Rogero annuatim iij.d. per diem pro feodis et vadiis pro officiis predictis a supradicto xij^o die Januarij quousque aliter per dictam Reginam aut eius consilium habuerit in mandatis, videlicet de huiusmodi feodis et vadiis suis iij.d. per diem infra tempus compoti, ac per acquietanciam ipsius Rogeri inter warranta huius compoti remanentem
—iiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d.

Et in vadiis eiusdem Rogeri equitantis diuersis vicibus hoc anno in negociis ipsius Regine ad diuersas partes Anglie per mandatum dicte Regine et consilij sui sui cum diuersis literis pro maiori commodo Regine per xxviiij dies infra tempus compoti, capientis per diem xij.d. per billam ipsius Rogeri inter warranta predicta remanentem
—xxviiij.s.

Summa feodorum et vadiorum officiariorum	}	cccxlx.li.iiij.s.viiij.d.
Regine extra hospicium		

fol. 17a

Annuitates

Et in quadam annuitate centum marcarum per dictam dominam Margaretam Reginam Anglie carissimo consanguineo suo Edmundo Duci Somerset¹ pro bono consilio suo et laudabili servicio quod predictus consanguineus suus eidem Regine impendit et impendet infuturum acceciam propter magnam affectionem et beneuolenciam quam dictus consanguineus Regine eidem in vrgentibus negociis suis ostendet concessa, percipienda annuatim de exitibus et reuencionibus dotis eiusdem Regine per manus generalis receptoris sui pro tempore existentis, per literas dicte Regine patentes xvj^o die Nouembris anno xxx^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti penes ipsum remanentes ac per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas xviiij^o die Februarij anno eiusdem Regis xxxj^{mo} prefato receptori suo generali directas et inter warranta de eodem remanentes, per quas quidem literas eadem Regina voluit et eidem receptore suo generali mandauit quod soluat prefato consanguineo suo annuatim c marcas ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis, eo quod eadem Regina per easdem suas de warranto concessit prefato consanguineo suo quod percipiet dictas c marcas annuatim a festo Sancti Michelis dicto anno xxx^{mo} ad terminos predictos per equales porciones, non obstante quod mencio non fit in eisdem literis patentibus Regine de predictis diebus solucionis, videlicet in persolucionem annuitatis predictae pro terminis predictis infra tempus predictum et per ij acquietancias ipsius ducis inter warranta huius compoti remanentes
—lxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et solutis Waltero Bursthede,² valetto equorum dicte Regine, de quodam riguardo c.s. per annum sibi concesso annuatim, percipiendo durante beneplacito

¹ Edmund Beaufort had been created Marquis of Dorset in 1443 and Duke of Somerset in 1448; he was killed at the first battle of St. Albans in 1455 (*C.P.* xii. 53).

² He was one of the four commissioned on 27 August 1444 to provide horses for the conducting of the new queen (*Foedera*, v. i. 137).

dicte Regine per manus receptoris generalis pro tempore existentis ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter, per literas dicte Regine patentes datas xiiij^o die Aprilis anno xxv^{to} dicti Regis Henrici vj^{ti} penes ipsum remanentes, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum ac per acquietanciam ipsius Walteri inter warranta predicta remanentem———c.s.

Et in quadam annuitate decem marcarum concessa Henrico Babyncourt, aresmaker, percipienda annuatim durante beneplacito dicte Regine per manus receptoris generalis pro tempore existentis ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter per literas eiusdem Regine patentes datas xiiij^{to} die Julij dicto anno xxv^{to} penes ipsum remanentes, necnon per acquietanciam dicti Henrici inter warranta huius compoti remanentem, videlicet, in persolucionem annuitatis predictę pro terminis supradictis infra tempus predictum———vj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et in quadam riguardo xl.s. per annum concessa Henrico Fisher, vni pedestrium dicte Regine, percipiendo annuatim durante beneplacito pefate Regine de exitibus et reuencibus dotis eiusdem Regine per manus generalis receptoris sui pro tempore existentis ad terminos Sancti Michelis et Pasche equaliter, per literas eiusdem Regine patentes datas xiiij^o die Nouembris dicto anno xxvj^{to} penes ipsum remanentes ac acquietanciam dicti Henrici inter warranta predicta remanentem, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum———xl.s.

Et in quadam annuitate cvj.s.viiij.d. concessa Micheli Belwell,¹ sirurgico Regine, percipienda annuatim durante beneplacito dicte Regine per manus receptoris generalis pro tempore existentis ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter per literas eiusdem Regine patentes datas xviiij^o die Aprilis dicto anno xxv^{to} penes ipsum remanentes, videlicet, pro terminis predictis infra tempus predictum ac per acquietanciam eiusdem inter warranta predicta remanentem———cvj.s.viiij.d.

Et in quadam annuo certo xl.s. concessa Johanni Pecok, valetto estuffure dicte Regine, in recompensacione custuum et expensarum per ipsum in dies habitorum et sustentacione equitando super equum ad suos proprios custus et expensas quamdiu eidem Regine placuerit, percipiendo annuatim ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter de exitibus et proficuis dotis sue Regine per manus receptoris generalis eiusdem Regine pro tempore existentis, per literas dicte Regine patentes datas xx^m^o die Februarij anno xxvj^{to} dicti Regis Henrici sexti penes ipsum remanentes ac per acquietanciam dicti Johannis inter warranta supradicta remanentem, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum———xl.s.

fol. 17b

Adhuc annuitates

Et in quadam riguardo xl.s. per annum concessa Jacobo Ainsley, vni pedestrium dicte Regine, percipiendo annuatim de exitibus et reuencibus dotis ipsius Regine per manus receptoris generalis eiusdem Regine pro tempore existentis ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter durante beneplacito ipsius Regine, per literas suas patentes datas die Aprilis (sic) anno xxvj^{to} dicti Regis Henrici sexti penes ipsum remanentes, ac per acquietanciam dicti Jacobi inter warranta huius compoti remanentem———xl.s.

¹ See note 1, p. 409.

Et in quodam riguardo xl.s. per annum concesso Johanni Skykker,¹ valetto de scaldynghouse dicte Regine, pro bono servicio eidem Regine in officio suo impenso et sic annuatim durante beneplacito ipsius Regine, per literas suas de warranto datas xxix^{no} die Septembris anno xxvij^o dicti Regis Henrici sexti, necnon acquietanciam eiusdem Johannis inter warranta predicta remanentem——xl.s.

Et in quodam riguardo c.s. per annum per prefatam Reginam Ricardo Whityngdon, valetto ferrure sue, concessa, percipiendo annuatim ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter, per literas dicte Regine patentis datas xxvij^o die Marcij anno xxvij^o dicti Regis Henrici sexti penes ipsum remanentes, ac acquietanciam ipsius Ricardi inter warranta supradicta remanentem——c.s.

Summa annuitatum predictarum——^{xx}—iiijxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Custus et expense necessarie

Et in pergamento, papiro, cera rubea et encausto emptis et expenditis (sic) in literis patentibus et alijs warrantis prefate Regine in officio cancellarie superscribendis hoc anno, per supradictas literas dicte Regine de warranto datas vij^o die Februarij anno xxxij^{do} dicti Regis Henrici sexti inter warranta huius compoti remanentes——lx.s.

Et in pergamento, papiro, cera rubea, et encausto, ac alijs diuersis necessarijs emptis et expenditis in officio dicti receptoris generalis Regine per dictum tempus huius compoti, per billam de parcellis inter warranta predicta remanentem——xlviij.s.viiij.d.

Et in pergamento et papiro emptis pro valoribus et memorandis et memorandis totius dotis dicte Regine tam in Anglia quam in Wallia hoc anno superscribendis——xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et solutis magistro Nicholao Carent,² clerico, secretario prefate Regine, pro pergamento, velym, encausto, et cera ad vsum dicte Regine per ipsum inuentis in officio secretarij iuxta appunctuamentum consilij ipsius Regine, per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas secundo die Decembris anno xxxj^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti inter warranta eiusdem anni remanentes, per quas quidem literas eadem Regina voluit et prefato receptori suo generali mandauit quod soluat prefato secretario suo annuatim xl.s. quamdiu idem secretarius Regine inueniet stuffuram predictam iuxta appunctuamentum consilij predicti, videlicet, in persoluzione dictorum xl.s. pro stuffura predicta per ipsum hoc anno inuenta——xl.s.

fol. 18a

Adhucustus et expense necessarie

Et in diuersis pixidibus emptis pro warrantis, acquietancijs, et alijs memorandis dicte Regine intus ponendis et saluo custodiendis hoc anno——xx.d.

Et in iij virgis panni viridis emptis pro tabula computatoria dicti receptoris generalis pro moneta dicte Regine desuper muneranda et superponenda, precio virge ij.s.iiij.d.——viij.s.

¹ Cf. above, fol. 13a, for his wage of 40s. a year.

² He was already Dean of Wells, an office to which he had been elected, probably with Margaret's help, in 1446 (Le Neve, op. cit. i, 152). For a letter written on his behalf by Margaret to the executor of his predecessor as Dean of Wells, see Munro, op. cit. pp. 93-4.

Et in v duodenis computatoriorum emptis pro officio dicti computus hoc anno, precio duodene iiij.d. ————— xx.d.

Et solutis Johanni Deryngton ¹ clerico receptoris generalis Ducatus Lancastrie pro intendencia et magno labore suo habitis in solucionem Mcccxxiiij.li. vj.s.viiij.d. prefate Regine de ducatu predicto assignatis, de regardo sibi facto pro eodem ex consideracione magni consilij Regine ————— xxvj.s.viiij.d.

Et solutis Willelmo Nanseglos, clerico recepte Regine, pro expensis suis morantis Londonie temporibus vacacionis per vices pro denarijs de diuersis receptoribus prefate Regine in absencia ipsius receptoris generalis, percipiendis ac pro denarijs de diuersis mercatoribus comitatus Cornubie per obligaciones custume pro cunagio stanni ibidem similiter recipiendis, per xxxij septimanas, capiendo per septimanam xx.d. ————— liij.s.iiij.d.

Et in batellagio dicti Willelmi de Londonia vsque Grenewiche ac de Londonia vsque Westmonasterium pro diuersis negocijs prefate Regine ibidem faciendis, quam pro moneta diuersis vicibus ibidem anno predicto super solucionem feodorum militum, dominarum, et damicellarum hospicii ac vadium armigerorum clericorum et aliorum officiariorum eiusdem hospicii ac privatarum expensarum eiusdem Regine, soluendo hoc anno ————— vj.s.viiij.d.—

Et in bagis de correo et panno lineo emptis tam pro rotulis valorum quam pro moneta Regine vsque Wyndesore et alibi cariandis et alijs ministris eiusdem Regine liberandis hoc anno ————— vj.s.viiij.d.

Et solutis Johanni Vailard, attornato dicte Regine, in cancellaria domini Regis de regardo sibi facto pro grandis laboribus suis pro dicti Regina in cancellaria predicta habitis, per supradictas literas Regine de warranto datas vij^o die Februarij dicto anno xxxij^{do} inter warranta supradicta remanentes ————— c.s.

Et solutis clericis duorum auditorum prefate Regine pro grandis laboribus suis in compotis diuersorum receptorum balliuorum et feodariorum ingrossandis, prout huiusmodi allocacio facta fuit tempore Katerine nuper Regine Anglie, cum vj.s.viiij.d. de regardo facto cuidam clerico auditorum de ausamento consilij pro scriptura istius compoti per predictam literam de warranto, vt supra, remanentem ————— xl.s.

Et solutis Roberto Tanfeld, generali attornato prefate Regine, pro diuersis custubus et expensis per ipsum factis in persecucionem breuium pro diuersis materijs dictam Reginam tangentibus ac solucionibus diuersis hominibus legisperitis pro ausamento et consilio suo habendis in diuersis materijs commodum dicte Regine tangentibus, vt patet per billam eiusdem Roberti de particulis inde inter warranta predicta remanentem ————— xxix.li.vij.s.ij.d.

Et solutis Johanni Fogge,² vicecomiti Kancie, pro quodam regardo sibi facto per ausamentum consilij ipsius Regine pro solucione xxij.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. de auro Regine per ipsum leuato de bonis et catallis debitis auri predicti hoc anno.

————— xxxiiij.s.iiij.d.

Summa expensarum, neccessiarum, et solucionum forinsecarum predictarum
————— lj.li.iiij.s.ij.d.

¹ For his biography, see Somerville, op. cit. pp. 399-400.

² It is interesting to find a reward being paid to one who was soon to be such a prominent Yorkist. For his biography, see Wedgwood, op. cit. pp. 339-42.

Soluciones per warrantam

Et solutis Willelmo Cotton, armigero, receptori generali Ducatus Lancastrie, cui prefata Margareta, considerans qualiter Galfridus Louthier, nuper receptor generalis ducatus predicti, habuit ex concessione et riguardo excellentissime principesse Katerine, nuper Regine Anglie, pro solucione certarum annuitatum quas ipsa habuit de exitibus ducatus predicti per manus dicti Galfridi pro quibuslibet c.li. sic liberatis ad vsum eiusdem xx.s. concessit eidem Willelmo, nunc receptori generali eiusdem ducatus, de speciali riguardo pro annuitate quas eadem Margareta Regina percipit de exitibus eiusdem ducatus per manus dicti nunc receptoris generalis pro quibuslibet c.li.xx.s., prout dictus Galfridus Louthier habuit, volens enim Regina quod idem Willelmus percipiet annuatim pro solucione quarumlibet c.li. quas idem receptor soluet ad vsum eiusdem Regine pro huiusmodi annuitate xx.s., videlicet, pro huiusmodi annuitate MM marcarum eidem Regine hoc anno liberata, per literas dicte Regine de warranto datas xxj^{mo} die Maij anno xxvij^o dicti Regis Henrici sexti inter warranta de eodem anno remanentes—xiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d.

Et Ricardo Bulstrode¹ pro vadijs et regardis diuersorum scissorum et pictatorum ac pro diuersis parcellis et stuffura emptis per speciale mandatum ipsius Regine pro disgisyng² facto coram Rege et prefata Regina apud manerium de Pleasaunce festo Natalis Domini anno xxxj^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti, per literas ipsius Regine de warranto datas xxx^{mo} die Januarij eodem anno xxxj^{mo} simul cum acquietancia ipsius Ricardi inter warranta huius compoti remanenti—xxv.li.ix.s.

Et magistro Willelmo Say³ decano capelle Regis pro oblacionibus Regine cotidianis iiij.d. per diem a retro existentibus a xij^o die Decembris anno xxx^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti vsque festum Pasche anno eiusdem Regis xxxij^{do} xxj diebus quolibet anno exceptis quibus eadem Regina optulit aurum, videlicet, diebus annuis Beate Marie, Parasceues, Pasche, Dominica in alibis, festo Sancti Georgij, Ascencionis, Pentecoste, Dominica in festo Sancte Trinitatis, Corporis Christi, Reliquiarum, Assumpcionis Beate Marie, Nativitatis eiusdem, die obitus Regis Henrici v^{ti}, diebus Omnium Sanctorum, Commemoracionis, Concepcionis Beate Marie, Natalis Domini, Circumsicionis, Epiphanie, die obitus Katerine nuper Regine matris dicti nunc Regis, et die Purificacionis Beate Marie,⁴ per literas dicte Margarete Regine de warranto datas x^{mo} die Maij anno dicti nunc Regis xxxj^{mo} ac per acquietanciam dicti decani simul inter warranta huius compoti, videlicet, pro huiusmodi oblacionibus cotidianis Regine a supradicto xij^o die Decembris anno xxx^{mo} vsque dictum festum Pasche anno xxxij^{do} per cccclij dies vltra dies (sic) in quibus dicta Regina optulit aurum—vij.li.xj.s.

¹ Cf. *ibid.* pp. 130-1.

² disgisyng, a masque or masquerade.

³ He was made dean of the king's chapel between May, 1448 and July, 1449 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, pp. 253, 259). He continued to be dean of the chapel royal under Edward IV, and in Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's surviving household account he is described as "decanus capelle dominorum Regis et Regine" (*E 36/207*, p. 37). He became dean of St. Paul's in 1457 (*C. N. L. Brooke*, "The Deans of St. Paul's, c. 1090-1499", *B.I.H.R.*, XXIX. 243).

⁴ This is more than the number of feasts for which special offerings were authorized in the household of Edward IV (*Household Ordinances*, p. 23).

Et Ricardo Roos militi de quodam prefato lx.li. per dictam Reginam sibi in recompensacionem tanti subbosci et ardi ligni, percipiendi infra forestam de Rokyngham, Whitelwode, et Saucy sicut attingere possit ad summam cxx.li., per dictum Regem eidem Ricardo concesso, quamquidem forestam idem Rex auctoritate parlamenti predictae Regine concessit,¹ et Regina considerans quod dicta concessio Regis eidem Ricardo facto (sic) vacua sit in lege concessit eidem Ricardo lx.li. per viam prestiti, de quibus idem Ricardus recepit xxx.li. in manibus et x.li., parcelam dicti lx.li., vigilia Pentecoste proxime sequenti, xxj^m diem Maij anno xxxj^m, et xxx.li. festo Nativitatis Sancti Johannis tunc proxime sequentis, resoluendas prefate Regine in talibus assignamentis sicut eidem Regi placuerit concedere eidem Ricardo in recompensacionem supradictarum cxx.li., per literas ipsius Regine de warranto datas xx^m die Maij dicto anno xxxj^m, simul cum indentura inde inter warranta huius compoti remanenti. De quibus quidem assignamentis reddit in fine huius compoti—xxx.li.

Et Philippo de Pynys ² mercatori de Venys pro panno et pannis serici et auri ab ipso emptis ad vsum ipsius Regine per Ricardum Bulstrode, servientem suum, ex speciali mandato ipsius Regine per literas suas de warranto datas xxx^m die Januarij dicto anno xxxj^m ac per acquietanciam ipsius Philippi simul inter warranta predicta remanentem—lxxij.li.xij.s.vj.d.

fol. 19a

Adhuc soluciones et warranta

Et Johanni Prudde vitriatori Regis ³ pro vitro et vitriacione vnus fenestre de duobus luminibus in capella Beate Marie de le Pew operate cum duobus ymaginibus Regis et Regine genuflectantium et salutacionis Beate Marie cum armis Regis et Regine florissched cum floribus necnon verbo Regine scripto, continentis large mensura peditis pauli xxxj pedites et dimidum, precio peditis xij.d. ac pro posicionem xix peditum veteris vitri scored in nouo plumbo, precio posicionis peditis iij.d. necnon pro vno Escochon de armis Edwardi Sancti posito in dicto veteri vitro, precio ij.s., et alterius Escochyn de armis Sancti Georgij

¹ *R.P.* v. 261. As this was an act passed in 1454 it is one of the many indications that this account was compiled, at the earliest, nearly a year after the official terminating date of Michaelmas, 1453.

² Not identified.

³ John Prudde was appointed king's glazier in September 1440 (*C.P.R. 1436-1441*, p. 469) with the use of "a 'shedde' called 'the glasiers logge' in the western part within Westminster palace, and a gown of the king's livery of the suit of the serjeant of the works yearly at Christmas". He and his men glazed the windows of Eton College, Fromond's Chantry in Winchester College, the resplendent Beauchamp Chapel at Warwick (J. Le Couteur, *English Medieval Painted Glass* (London, 1926), pp. 19, 21, 29, 30, 110, 120 and references there given); also the windows of All Souls College, Oxford (E. F. Jacob, "The Building of All Souls College, 1438-43" in *Historical Essays in honour of James Tait* (1933), p. 131).

The Chapel of our Lady of the Pew, mentioned here, was destroyed in Henry VII's time to make a Chapel of St. Erasmus. It stood on the north side of the ambulatory at the entrance to the present Chapel of St. John the Baptist. (F. Bond, *Westminster Abbey* (London, 1909), pp. 252-3; W. R. Lethaby, *Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen* (London, 1906), pp. 352-55; *The Westminster Abbey Guide* (28th edn., London, 1936), p. 83).

positi in dicto veteri vitro, precio xij.d., in toto attingentibus ad xxxix.s.iiij.d., per literas ipsius Regine de warranto datas vij^o die Junij anno xxxj^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti ac acquietanciam ipsius Johannis simul inter warranta predicta remanentem—xxxix.s.

Et Ricardo Salisbury de Soham in comitatu Cantebrigie et Johanni Wright tenenti eiusdem Ricardi, videlicet, tam x.li. in contentacionem et satisfacionem dampnorum et perditorum eidem Ricardo factorum in combustionem stabuli eiusdem Ricardi in Newmarket per infortunium ignis tempore quo eadem Regina ibidem perhendinauit quam lxvj.s.viii.d. pro certis lectis bladij et alia stuffura eiusdem Johannis combustis in eadem domo, per literas Regine de warranto datas v^{to} die Julij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} ac acquietanciam ipsorum Ricardi et Johannis simul inter warranta predicta remanentem—xiiij.li.vj.s.viii.d.

Et Matheo Phelipp^r, aurifabro Londonie,¹ in persolucionem cxxv.li.x.s.vij.d. sibi debitorum pro certis iocalibus et goldsmythwerk ab eo vsum Regine emptis, per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas xvij^o die Julij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} ac acquietanciam ipsius Mathei simul inter warranta predicta remanentem—cxxv.li.x.s.

Et Johanni Wenlock,² militi camerario Regine, in plenam solucionem xxiiij.li.vj.s.viii.d. pro tribus palfridis ab eo ad vsum Regine emptis, per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas xvij^o die Julij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} ac acquietanciam ipsius Johannis simul inter warranta predicta remanentem—xxiiij.li.vj.s.viii.d.

Et predicto Johanni Wenlok, militi camerario Regine, pro viij.li.xiiij.s. per ipsum liberatis Johanni Hattecliff, clerico auenario Regine, mense Nouembris anno xxix^{mo} Regis Henrici sexti, videlicet, vj.li.xiiij.s. pro vadijs certorum seruientium stabuli Regine, xxxiiij.s.iiij.d. pro plena solucione vnus equi empti de Rogero Dyke, et vj.s.viii.d. datis seruientibus stabuli dicte Regine de regardo ex mandato dicte Regine, per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas xvij^o die Julij dicto anno xxx^{mo} ac acquietanciam ipsius Johannis Wenlok militis simul inter warranta predicta remanentem—viij.li.xiiij.s.

Et Thome Saintbarbe, Humfrido Stafford, ac Roberto Chicheley, armigeris hospicii Regine, Willelmo Lepton, valetto ostiario camere Regine, de regardo per prefatam Reginam de regardo sibi facto ad grandes custus quos quilibet habuit et sustinuit in graui infirmitate per visitacionem divinam, videlicet, Thome Saintbarbe xxvj.s.viii.d., Humfrido Stafford liij.s.iiij.d., Roberto Chicheley xxxiiij.s.iiij.d., et Willelmo Lepton xiiij.s.iiij.d., per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas xxiiij^{to} die Julij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} ac acquietanciam ipsorum Thome, Humfridi, Roberti, et Willelmi simul inter warranta predicta remanentem—vj.li.vj.s.viii.d.

fol. 19b

Adhuc soluciones per warranta

Et Thome Bateman et Johanni Hardwik,³ clericis, ad prouidendum et ordinandum totum illud victualium et alia necessaria pro diebus sabbati et

¹ He had already become alderman of London by 1450 and was sheriff of London in 1452 (C.P.R. 1446-1452, pp. 401, 558, 570). He had been made king's goldsmith as long ago as 1443 (C.P.R. 1441-1446, p. 235).

² See Introduction BULLETIN, xl (1957), 97, and n. 107.

³ In 1454 Thomas Bateman had become a clerk of the greencloth, and John Hardwik clerk of the kitchen, in the royal household (Nicolas, op. cit. vi. 226, 228).

dominice, iiij^{to} et v^{to} diebus Augusti anno xxxij^{do}, pro maritagiis dominarum Elizabeth Botiller et Edith Seintlowe,¹ vt pro prouidencia causa maritagiorum predictorum attingencia ad summam xvj.li.xxij.d. vltra expensis diurnis hospicij Regis, vino deducto, sicut apparet de recordo in libris compotorum hospicij predicti, per literas dicte Regine de warranto datas nono die Septembris dicto anno xxxij^{do} ac acquietanciam ipsorum Thome et Johannis simul inter warranta huius compoti remanentem—xvj.li.xxij.d.

Et Johanni Sergeant, nuncio Regine, cui prefata Margareta Regina concessit tres denarios per diem, percipiendos annuatim de exitibus et reuencibus dotis sue per manus generalis receptoris sui pro tempore existentis ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis per equales porciones quamdiu eidem Regine placuerit dicto Johanni infra siue extra curiam Regine esistenti, non obstante prouiso semper quod idem Johannes in rotulo scaccarij Regine pro vadijs trium denariorum per diem siue infra siue extra curiam predictam extiterit a primo die Aprilis dicto anno xxxj^{mo} non ponatur siue tituletur, per literas eiusdem Regine patentes datas eodem primo die Aprilis anno xxxj^{mo} penes ipsum remanentes, necnon per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas xxij^e¹⁰ die Nouembris dicto anno xxxij^{do}, ac acquietanciam eiusdem Johannis simul inter warranta predicta remanentem, videlicet, de huiusmodi vadijs suis a supradicto primo die Aprilis anno xxxj^{mo} vsque supradictum festum Sancti Michelis tunc proxime sequentem, scilicet per ciiij j dies iuxta ratam vadiorum predictorum per idem tempus—xlv.s.iiij.d.

Et Willelmo Say,² decano capelle Regis, in vno cippo valoris xx marcarum per dictum Willelmum Cotton empto et eidem decano liberato, pro lumine et apparello de reignes³ pro fonte principis,⁴ quam pro le crisme,⁵ lumine et oblacione die purificationis Regine, necnon pro oblacionibus sibi debitis pro tempore quo eadem Regina custodiebat et exstitebat in camera sua, per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas xxix^{mo} die Nouembris dicto anno xxxij^{do} ac acquietanciam eiusdem decani simul inter warranta predicta remanentem—xij.li.vj.s.vij.d.

Et valettis, garcionibus, et pagettis camere et aule domini Regis de regardo per dictam Reginam sibi pro bona attendencia circa prefatum Regem hoc anno per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas xij^o die Decembris dicto anno xxxij^{do} inter warranta predicta remanentes—c.li.

¹ See note 2, p. 404, and note 2, p. 405.

² See note 3, p. 422.

³ "Cloth of Raines", a kind of fine linen or lawn made at Rennes in Brittany (*N.E.D.*).

⁴ Edward, Prince of Wales, was born on 13 October 1453 (*An English Chronicle*, ed. J. S. Davies (Camden Soc., 1856), p. 70). One of his godfathers was Edmund, Duke of Somerset, mentioned in this account (fol. 17a). £10 was paid for the wax lights burnt at Edward's baptism (*Devon. Issues*, p. 478).

⁵ "chrisom-robe", a white robe put on a child at baptism as a token of innocence, and given as an offering at the mother's purification (*N.E.D.*). The embroidered chrisom-cloth, with 20 yards of russet of gold and 540 "broun sable bakkes", worth altogether £554 16s. 8d., were a present from the king to the queen (*Devon. op. cit.* p. 478).

Et Thome, domino de Scales,¹ de regardo sibi per dictam dominam Reginam pro diurna diligencia et attendencia in consilio eiusdem Regine per literas dicte Regine datas xix^{no} die Decembris dicto anno xxxij^{do}² ac acquietanciam ipsius Thome domini de Scales simul inter warranta predicta remanentem——x.li.

Et Osanne Herman,³ vni domicellarum Regine, de dono suo ad maritagiū eiusdem pro literas dicte Regine de warranto datas vj^{to} die Marcij dicto anno xxxij^{do} ac acquietanciam ipsius Osanne simul inter warranta supradicta remanentem——cc.li.

Summa solutionum per warranta predicta——Dclxx.li.xv.s.xj.d.

Allocacio superplusagij

Et in allocacione Willelmo Cotton, receptori generali dicte Regine, pro superplusagio suo in compoto suo de huiusmodi recepta de anno proxime precedenti habito——xxxj.li.x.s.vj.d.ob.

Summa allocacionum superplusagij predicti——xxxj.li.x.s.vj.d.ob.⁴

fol. 20a

Liberacio forinseca

* Et Roberto Ketilwell, clerico operacionum ac prouisori stuffure manerij de Pleasance in Grenewich, super prouidencia et empcone stuffurarum ad idem per literas dicte Regine de warranto xx^{mo} die Julij anno xxv^{to} dicti Regis Henrici sexti inter warranta de anno xxvj^{to} eiusdem Regis remanentes ad v. vices, videlicet, prima vice secundo die Marcij anno xxxij^{do} Regis predicti xij.li., secunda vice xvij^o die Aprilis eodem anno xl.s., tercia vice vij^o die Junij anno predicto xl.s., iiij^{ta} vice vij^o die Julij eodem anno iiij.li., et v^{ta} vice xxiiij^{to} die eiusdem mensis vij.li.viii.s.ij.d. per vnam indenturam inde inter warranta huius compoti remanentem——xxvij.li.viii.s.ij.d.

Et Johanni Hattecliff, clerico auenariorum dicte Regine, super empcone et prouisione feni, auenarum, necessariorum, ac cariagio et solucionibus pro vadijs stabuli et alijs infra tempus huius compoti, per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas vltimo die Decembris anno xxv^{to} dicti Regis Henrici sexti inter warranta de anno xxvj^{to} eiusdem Regis remanentes ad diuersas vices, videlicet, prima vice xvj^o die Maij dicto anno xxxj^{mo}, xxxvij.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d., secunda vice xxij^{do} die Junij eodem anno ^{xx}iiij.li., tercia vice xij^o die Septembris anno xxxij^{do} supradicto vij.li., iiij^{ta} vice xxiiij^e¹⁰ die Nouembris eodem anno xxx.li., v^{ta} vice xx^{mo} die Februarij eodem anno cxl.li., vj^{ta} vice primo die Marcij dicto anno xxxij^{do} xx.li., vij^a vice xj^{mo} die eiusdem mensis per manus Johannis Pigot x.li.x.s.x.d., viij^a

¹ He had married Ismania, one of the queen's ladies, and was killed at London in 1460 in the Lancastrian cause; see above, fol. 12a and note 1, p. 404.

² It will be noted that this and the preceeding three payments were made after Michaelmas, 1453, when the account purports to end.

³ See above, note 2, pp. 405-6.

⁴ Evidently the previous account had ended with a deficit; this was characteristic of the royal finances by this time. See Introduction, BULLETIN, xl (1957), 87, n. 3.

* This paragraph has in the left-hand margin the note "Robertus Ketilwell, clericus operacionum manerij de Pleasance".

vice xix^{mo} die eiusdem mensis x.li., ix^a vice xxij^o die eiusdem mensis x.li., x^a vice xij^o die Aprilis predicto anno xxxij^o xv.li.xiiij.s.v.d.ob., xj^{ma} vice xvj^o die Aprilis xxxij^o c.s., xij^{ma} vice dictis die et anno vj.li., xij^{ma} vice xvij^o die eiusdem mensis xx.li. et xiiij^a vice nono die Maij dicti anno xxxij^o, xvij.li.vj.s.vij.d., per vnam indenturam inde inter warranta huius compoti remanentem—

cccx.li.v.s.iiij.d.ob.

Et Johanni Norrys,¹ armigero, custodi magne garderobe dicte Regine, pro expensis factis super empcionem prouisionum et expensas in officio garderobe

predicte ad vsum dicte Regine hoc anno in partem solucionis MMiiij.^{xx}xvij.li.ix.s.vj.d.ob.q. eidem Johanni, per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas xij^o die Octobris dicto anno xxxij^o inter warranta huius compoti remanentes ad diuersas vices, videlicet, prima vice x^{mo} die Septembris eodem anno xxxij^o xvij.li., secunda vice primo die Octobris eodem anno M.li., tercia vice xx^{mo} eiusdem mensis D.li., quarta vice dictis die et anno per manus vicecomitis ville Suthampton l.li., quinta vice dictis die et anno xxxij.li.ij.s.j.d.q., sexta vice xxvij^o die eiusdem mensis x.li.xij.s.iiij.d., vij^a vice xx^{mo} die Nouembris eodem anno xxxij^o viij.li., viij^a vice penultimo die eiusdem mensis per manus balliuorum ville Norhampton xlvj.li.xj.s.iiij.d., ix^{na} vice xx^{mo} die Decembris eodem anno x.li., x^{ma} vice dictis die et anno ccc.li.xix.s., xj^{ma} vice xxij^o die eiusdem mensis lxxij.s.iiij.d., et

xij^{ma} vice x^{mo} die Octobris dicto anno xxxij^o iiij.^{xx}xij.li.vj.s.vij.d. per xij indenturas inde inter warranta predicta remanentes—MM.lxxij.li.v.s.vij.d.q.†

Et Edwardo Ellesmere,² thesaurario camere et custodi iocalium prefate Regine, pro solucionibus et expensis factis et habitis in officio iocalium predicto, in persolucionem lxxvj.li.xij.s.iiij.d. eidem Edwardo assignatis per literas dicte Regine de warranto datas xvj^o die Maij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} ad duas vices, videlicet, vna vice xx^{mo} die eiusdem mensis Maij xxxij.li.vj.s.vij.d. et altera vice viij^o die

¹ He was already a yeoman of the king's chamber in 1429 (*C.P.R. 1429-1436*, p. 37) and an esquire for the king's body by 1441 (*C.P.R. 1436-1441*, p. 568). In October 1444 he was appointed, as from the previous Michaelmas, keeper of the king's great wardrobe (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 311), an office which he retained until Michaelmas, 1446 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 4). In April 1447 he was appointed, as from Michaelmas 1446, treasurer of the chamber and master of the jewels of Queen Margaret (E 101/409/14), an office which he retained until Michaelmas 1452 (E 101/410/8). In 1462 he was pardoned as a Lancastrian and died in 1466 (Wedgwood, op. cit. p. 639).

² He was already clerk of the queen's jewels in September 1445 (*C.P.R. 1441-1446*, p. 373) and was still occupying this post in 1451 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 456). At Michaelmas 1452 he became treasurer of the queen's chamber (E 101/410/8). He fought on the Lancastrian side at Towton, and was attainted in the Parliament of 1461 (*Rot. Parl.* v. 177b); in 1475 the attainder was reversed, at his petition, and some of his possessions were restored (*Rot. Parl.* vi. 130a-131a). In 1485 he successfully petitioned Henry VII for the return of lands, tenements, and offices acquired by one of Edward IV's physicians, Jacques Frus, or James Friis (ibid. p. 327b). Ellesmere was probably dead by November 1489 (*Cal. Close Rolls, 1485-1500*, p. 144).

† This paragraph has two notes in the left-hand margin: "reddit hoc anno de Mcx.li.vj.s.vij.d." and "reddit anno futuro de Dcccclxij.li.xix.s.q.^a".

Nouembris supradicto anno xxxij^{do} xxxiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d. per ij indenturas simul vt supra remanentes—lxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

fol. 20b

Adhuc liberacio forinseca

Et prefato Edwardo Ellesmere, thesaurario camere ac custodi iocalium ipsius Regine, in partem solucionis Dcccxxxviiij.li.xiiij.d.ob. prefato Edwardo per literam eiusdem Regine de warranto datam iiij^{to} die Nouembris supradicto anno xxxij^{do} Regis predicti assignatis, pro solucionibus et expensis factis et habitis in officio jocalium predictorum ad x vices, videlicet, prima vice xxvj^{to} die Decembris dicti anno xxxij^{do} cc.li., secunda vice penultimo die Januarij eodem anno xl.li., tercia vice xiiij^o die Februarij eodem anno x.li., iiij^{ta} vice xiiij^o die eiusdem mensis xxxv.li.xviiij.s.xj.d.ob., v^{ta} vice tercio die Marcij dicto anno xxxij^{do} xl.li., vj^{ta} vice xj^m^{xx} die eiusdem mensis ciij.li., vij^a vice xviiij^o die Aprilis eodem anno xxxij^{do} x.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d., octava vice viij^o die Marcij eodem anno xl.li.x.s.x.d., ix^{na} vice per manus Thome Payn' nuper vicecomitis ville Suthampton x^m die Julij anno predicto l.li., et x^{ma} vice per manus dicti Edwardi receptori de Odyam et Guillyngham lxvj.li. per x indenturas inde inter warranta huius compoti remanentes—Dclxxiiij.li.iiij.s.j.d.

Et eidem Edwardo Ellesmere in persolucionem xx.li. sibi assignatarum pro solucionibus et expensis in officio iocalium predicto, per literas ipsius Regine de warranto datas xxviiij^o die Decembris supradicto anno xxxij^{do} xxij^{do} Januarij eodem anno, per indenturam vt supra remanentem—xx.li.

Et prefato Edwardo Ellesmere, thesaurario camere et magistro iocalium ipsius Regine, in partem solucionis x.li. sibi assignatarum pro huiusmodi solucionibus et expensis in officio iocalium predicto, per literas dicte Regine de warranto datas xxviiij^o die Decembris supradicto anno xxxij^{do} per manus cancellarie Regine decimo die Februarij eodem anno per indenturam inde simul cum warranto predicto inter warranta huius compoti remanentem—vj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et eidem Edwardo Ellesmere, thesaurario camere et magistro iocalium prefate Regine, in plenam solucionem xxxiiij.li. sibi vt supra assignatarum, per literas eiusdem Regine de warranto datas vj^{to} die Februarij supradicto anno xxxij^{do} ix^{no} die eiusdem mensis per indenturam vt supra remanentem—xxxiiij.li.

Et Johanni, domino Stourton,¹ nuper thesaurario hospicii Regis Henrici sexti, pro dietis diurnis et expensis eiusdem Regine in hospicio predicto vij.li. per diem a xv^m die Septembris anno eiusdem Regis xxviiij^o et deinceps, per literas dicte Regine de warranto datas xxviiij^o die Marcij eodem anno inter warranta de anno xxx^m eiusdem Regis remanentes, per quas quidem literas prefata Regina mandauit dicto receptori suo generali quod de exitibus recepte sue prefato Johanni domino Stourton, thesaurario hospicii Regis predicti, dictas vij.li. per

¹ He was created Lord Stourton on 13 May 1448 and died 25 November 1462 (C.P. xii. i. 301-2). He was treasurer of the household before 18 November 1446 (C.P.R. 1446-1452, p. 8) and he still occupied this post in September 1452 (E 101/410/9). He was one of those who signed the ordinance, dated 13 November 1454, for the regulation of the royal household during the king's madness (Nicolas, op. cit. vi. 233).

diem per tempus predictum et sic deinceps secundum ratam vij.li. per diem de die in diem et anno in annum (soluat) quousque idem receptor generalis aliter habuerit in mandatis ad diuersas vices, videlicet, prima vice xxvij^o die Aprilis anno dicti Regis nunc xxix^{mo} iiii.li.xix.s., secunda vice xxix^{no} die eiusdem mensis cçj.li.xviii.s., tertia vice xv^{mo} die Decembris anno xxx^{mo} eiusdem Regis cxxxj.li. xiiij.s.vj.d.ob., iiij^{ta} vice xij^o die Marcij eodem anno xj.li.vj.s., v^{ta} vice xx^{mo} die Nouembris anno xxxj^{mo} cl.li., vj^{ta} vice xij^o die Februarij eodem anno xv.li., vij^a vice xij^o die Marcij eodem anno cc.li., viij^a vice xvij^o die eiusdem mensis l.li., ix^{na} vice dictis die et anno xlviij.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d., x^{ma} vice xx^{mo} die eiusdem mensis xj.li.v.s.x.d., xj^{ma} vice dictis die et anno x.li., xij^{ma} vice eisdem die et anno vj.li.xiiij.s., et xij^{ma} vice xx^{mo} die eiusdem mensis Marcij xxiiij.li.xix.s.vij.d. per xij acquietancias inde inter warranta huius compoti remanentes—

Dccclxv.li.x.s.iiij.d.

Et eidem nuper thesaurario hospicij predicti super dietis diurnis et expensis predictæ Regine de warranto in proxima particula precedenti annotatas ad duas vices, videlicet, vna vice primo die Januarij anno xxx^{mo} Regis predicti c.li., et altera vice xvij^o die Marcij anno eiusdem Regis xxxj^{mo} xxxvij.s., per ij acquietancias inde inter warranta predicta remanentes—cj.li.xvij.s.

fol. 21a

Adhuc liberacio forinseca

Et Johanni, domino de Duddeley,¹ thesaurario hospicij domini Regis, super dietis diurnis et expensis dicte Regine in hospicio predicto vij.li. per diem a xxvij^o die Marcij anno xxxj^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti vsque finem Sancti Michelis tunc proxime sequentem et deinceps per literas dicte Regine de warranto datas xxvj^o die Octobris anno eiusdem Regis xxxij^{do} inter warranta huius compoti remanentes per quas quidem literas prefata Regina mandauit dicto receptori suo generali quod de exitibus recepte sue prefato Johanni domino de Duddeley thesaurario hospicij Regis predicti dictos vij.li. per diem per tempus predictum et sic deinceps secundum ratam vij.li. per diem de die in diem et anno in annum soluat quousque idem receptor generalis aliter habuerit in mandatis ad diuersas vices, videlicet, prima vice xv^o die Maij dicto anno xxxj^{mo} xlix.li., secunda vice xj^{mo} die Aprilis eodem anno x.li., tertia vice xvij^o die Junij anno predicto xx.li., iiij^{ta} vice xxj^{mo} die eiusdem mensis x.li., quinta vice dictis die et anno

¹ He succeeded Lord Stourton as treasurer of the household at Michaelmas 1452 (see previous note), but he did not hold the office long. By October 1454 he had been succeeded by William Fallen (E 101/410/15) who was in 1455 followed by John Brecknock (C.P.R. 1452-1461, p. 295). Brecknock was one of those who had conducted Margaret to England in 1445 (B.M. Add. MS. 23,938; Stevenson, op. cit. i. 448); in this account he appears as receiver-general of the Duchy of Cornwall (ff. 5b, 6a) and by 1454 he had become clerk of controlment in the king's household (Nicolas, op. cit. vi. 226).

John Sutton was summoned to parliament from 15 February 1440 to 1 September 1487 as Lord Dudley; he died 30 September 1487 aged 86 (C.P. iv. 479-80). He was one of the king's councillors against whom the Commons petitioned in 1451 (Rot. Parl. v. 216b). He was taken prisoner with Henry VI at the first battle of St. Albans (Paston Letters, i. 327, 336) and was wounded on the Lancastrian side at Blore Heath. (R.P. v. 348).

x.li., sexta vice octavo die Augusti dicto anno xxxj^o ix.li.iii.s., septima vice ix^o die eiusdem mensis iii.j.li.vij.s.iii.d., octava vice xvij^o die Septembris supradicto anno xxxij^{do}, lxvj.s.vij.d., nona vice penultimo die Octobris eodem anno, c.li., decima vice sexto Nouembris eodem anno, lxv.li.xvij.s.vij.d.ob., xj^{ma} vice tercio die Decembris anno predicto xii.j.li.vj.s.vij.d., xij^{ma} vice xx^{mo} die eiusdem mensis, c.li., et xij^a vice iiiij^{to} die Junij supradicto anno xxxij^{do} xlvi.s.vij.d., per xiiij acquietancias ipsius thesaurarij inde inter warranta supradicta remanentes

—^{xx}Dcciiij.xvij.li.vij.s.xj.d.ob.

Liberacio denariorum in cameram Regine

Et in denarijs liberatis prefate Regine in cameram suam ad v. vices, videlicet, prima vice xx^{mo} die Maij anno xxxj^{mo} dicti Regis Henrici sexti c.li., secunda vice xxv^{to} die Junij eodem anno c.li., tercia vice primo die Decembris anno xxxij^{do} eiusdem Regis cc.li., quarta vice primo die Januarij eodem anno c.li., et quinta vice sexto die Marcij eodem anno lxvj.li.xiiij.s.iii.d. per v acquietancias sub magno sigillo ipsius Regine inter warranta predicta remanentes——Dlxvj.li.xiiij.s.iii.d.¹ Summa liberacionum denariorum predictorum——v M.Dcxliij.li.xvij.s.vj.d.q^a.

fol. 21b

Summa omnium allocacionum solucionum et liberacionum denariorum predictorum——vij M.Dxxxix.li.xv.s.iii.d.ob.q^a.²

Et debet——xxiiij.li.xvj.s.vij.d.q^a.

De quibus.

fols. 22a and b both blank.

fol. 23a

(In a very cursive hand) cccxxiiij.li.xj.li.xj.s.iiij.d. de recompensacione Regine pro annuitatibuz diuersarum personarum qui acciderunt in manubus eiusdem Regine per mortem earundem, videlicet, anno xxxiiij^o cciiij.j.li.x.s.v.d. Item, pro Bradfeld vj.li.xiiij.s.iiiij.d. Item, Et remanet——^{xx}xxxvj.li.vij.s.vj.d.

Item, pro anno xxxiiij^{to} ccciiij.j.li.x.s.v.d. Item, pro Bradfeld vj.li.xiiij.s.iiiij.d. Item pro Johanne Marshall ^{xx}lx.s.vij.d. Et remanet——xxxiiij.li.vj.s.x.d.⁴

¹ See Introduction, BULLETIN, xl (1957), 98.

² Ibid. p. 88.

³ Both Thomas Bradfeld and John Marshall were yeomen of the king's chamber (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 543; *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 21), and these may have been payments for services rendered to the queen.

⁴ It was stated in the introduction that this account "does not appear to have been used by any of the biographers of the queen" (BULLETIN, xl (1957), 80). Since writing this I have noted that in the third edition of her *Lives of the Queens of England* Miss Agnes Strickland added a reference to this account (3rd edn., 1864, reprinted 1891, i. 565-6). It was enterprising for a woman to have used such a source in mid-Victorian days; but the reference is only slight and the source is in various respects both misquoted and misunderstood.

GLOSSARY

(This list includes only those non-classical words which cannot readily be found in the *Medieval Latin Word-List*, ed. J. H. Baxter and C. Johnson, Oxford, 1934).

aquaria = ewry.

auenaria = office which provided fodder.

cateria = acatery, the office which bought meat and fish for the household.

cunagium stanni = fee for stamping tin.

finire = to pay.

paynmaynbaker = baker of fine bread.

scaldinghous = household office for boiling poultry.

squilleria = scullery.

sirurgicus = surgeon.

superplusagium = balance in favour of the accountant.

valettus = yeoman.

COURSE OF PLAYS, 1740-2:
AN EARLY DIARY OF RICHARD CROSS,
PROMPTER TO THE THEATRES

Edited by HARRY WILLIAM PEDICORD, M.A., PH.D., D.D.

Introduction

AN actor seldom admits his need of a prompter. Let that functionary handle such other duties as his manager pleases. But the actor has his pride. Nowhere is this attitude more evident than in London theatres of the eighteenth century. And to their credit let it be said that most "legitimate" performers in those theatres knew their repertoire. The number of new plays in a particular season was small and the screening of provincial actors fine indeed, despite the efforts of high-born friends to influence managers on behalf of their writer and actor favourites. A prompter in the literal sense was required only on first-nights of new productions, or when drunkenness in the cast or a riotous house confused otherwise professionals.

From the Restoration on a prompter's duties included not only the supplying of occasional forgotten lines, but also the copying of "sides", the calling and conduct of routine rehearsals, timing performances, handling the manager's correspondence, consoling the wounded vanities of cast and public, the writing of "puffs", and the relief of indisposed actors even as late as curtain-time, or as the actors would have said, "first or second music".

In what must surely be an irony of theatrical history, the names of David Garrick and his prompter Richard Cross are so welded as to bring belated notice and reflected glory to a fine actor and loyal employee. Richard Cross was the older man. It was he who prompted the night young Garrick made his legitimate debut on the occasion of Widow Harper's benefit

Began to Play at Covent Garden Sep: 19 th 1740.		
1	Fri 19	Richardson & Dragon — 100
2	Mon 22	Burwell & Blud. & m: Dr — 080
3	Wed 24	Comminlee & Scapin — 070
4	Fri 26	Macbeth — 070
5	Mon 29	D: Dealer & m: Dr — 100
		October
6	Wed 1 st	D: Gallant & Tanager — 070
7	Fri 3	Royal Misch. & Scapin — 050
8	Mon 6	Frop's Fortuna & Tanager — 080
9	Wed 8	Bro: Mike & m: Dr — 060
10	Fri 10	Byle a Wife & Orpheus — 130
11	Sat 11	Tender Husband & D: — 070
12	Mon 13	Busie Body & D: — 060
13	Wed 15	Mistake & D: — 070
14	Th 16	Duke and no Duke & D: — 060
15	Fri 17	Drummer & D: — 050
Rec'd 3 Days — Brinsford —		
Rec'd 3 Days —		
Rec'd 4 Days —		
Giffard open'd W. T. —		

(Drury Lane, Tuesday, 11 May 1742) following a triumphant début and full season under Giffard's management at the "minor" theatre in Goodman's Fields.

The following season found Garrick established at Drury Lane (1742-3). And to Drury Lane had come also the Crosses, Richard and his actress wife Frances, along with Margaret Woffington and actors Arthur, Neale, Delane, and Cibber, Jr. (1741-2). Thus the relation between Cross, his wife, and the great Garrick became permanent, to be dissolved only on the death of Cross in 1760, the death of Garrick in 1779. But without the prompter's faithful performance of multiple duties his name would now be forgotten. And in a very real sense, without his faithfulness we should now know much less about the star's career.

Richard Cross kept seasonal diaries or theatrical calendars. Here he recorded not only the night's bill, but also box-office grosses, green-room gossip, and his own reflections upon performances, managers, actors and audiences. The bulk of his labour as diarist is now a part of the thirteen manuscript diaries of Drury Lane Theatre known as the Cross-Hopkins Diaries among the holdings of the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C. The Folger Diaries range from the opening night of the Garrick-Lacy management of Drury Lane, Tuesday, 15 September 1747, through the star's retirement in 1776.

The John Rylands manuscript, presented here in its entirety for the first time, is unique in that it appears to be the earliest extant Cross diary, antedating the Folger holdings by some five seasons. It records conditions and repertory at Covent Garden and Drury Lane Theatres when Garrick and Woffington made their legitimate débuts. Its existence makes it reasonable to conjecture still other Cross diaries accounting for at least five seasons prior to 1747-8, and perhaps some seasons before 1740-1. The diary is a little calf-bound notebook of thirty-four folios measuring 180 × 112 mm. There is no indication of authorship or provenance. It was acquired by the John Rylands Library in November 1947.

It was my privilege to identify Richard Cross as the compiler of Rylands English MS. IIII and to present my arguments in the

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, March 1955. Such proofs have without exception met with general acceptance. In brief they are as follows :

1. The single clue to the identity of the compiler is a marginal note opposite a performance of Buckingham's *The Rehearsal* (Thursday, 18 December 1740, Covent Garden). This reads, "Cibber sick, I did Bayes". Now it was apparent that the compiler must have been an actor, an actor who was to desert Covent Garden for Drury Lane's company the following season. But none of the actors—Arthur, Delane, Neale—were intimate with the business affairs of the theatres and qualified or permitted to set down details of the box office. Only a prompter, himself an actor, could perform both duties. And when evidence pointed to twenty-four major rôles in twenty-five acting years of the life of Richard Cross ; when his wife Frances was the only woman to accompany Mrs. Woffington in her transfer to Drury Lane (1741-2) ; and when the Rylands manuscript divides itself into the seasons 1740-1 and 1741-2, it was clear that Richard Cross and only Richard Cross was the actor-prompter who compiled the calendar.
2. Further evidence that the compiler was Richard Cross is to be found in an examination of the financial affairs recorded in the manuscript. Two benefit performances, one at Covent Garden (4 May 1741) and the other at Drury Lane (8 May 1742), are noted in the manuscript as—"Cross *etc.* Tick^{ts}" and "I had Tickets *etc.*". From other sources we know that both performances had been advertised as benefits for Richard Cross.
Even more significant is a notation closing the 1740-1 season, where the compiler writes "left Due 8 Days—£5 6s. 8d." John Rich appears to have owed the compiler for eight working days, which at 6s. 8d. per day would amount to only £2 13s. 4d. But when we recall that Frances Cross is not listed for a benefit in either season, although a prominent member of both acting companies, and that her salary for an equivalent period would amount to £2 13s. 4d., a combined salary for Mr. and Mrs. Cross would exactly equal the sum our compiler claimed to be owing from his manager.

Such evidence confirms my belief that Richard Cross is the author of Rylands English MS. IIII.

Of the thirty-four folios comprising the manuscript, fols. 1^v-2, 27, and 27^v are blank. Within space limitations, material on the remaining pages has been reproduced as nearly as possible in conformance with the nature and spirit of Cross's Diary. I have therefore preserved certain peculiarities of the manuscript, including the original punctuation and spelling. The problem of making eighteenth-century "shorthand" and "short titles" intelligible to modern readers is met by the use of brackets to interpolate letters, words, and alternate play titles upon their initial appearance.

Again I wish to thank Dr. Frank Taylor, Keeper of Manuscripts, Professor Edward Robertson, Librarian, and the Governors of the John Rylands Library for their courtesy in making Rylands English MS. IIII available to scholars and their kind assistance in its publication. It is also my concern to acknowledge the assistance and advice of Charles Beecher Hogan, Arthur H. Scouten, Philip H. Highfill, Jr., and George Winchester Stone, Jr., to whom I am indebted for many items in the editing of this vital link between the theatre of Booth, Cibber and Wilkes and that of Rich, Fleetwood, Garrick and Lacy.¹

¹ Mr. Hogan's work, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, has been indispensable. And through the kindness of the authors it has been my privilege to study the as yet unpublished revision of John Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage*, as revised, corrected and enlarged by Emmett L. Avery, Arthur H. Scouten, George Winchester Stone, Jr., and William Van Lennep. I am especially indebted to Professor Philip H. Highfill, Jr., who devoted a beautiful summer day to assisting me in identifying many performers whose names appear in the manuscript. Mr. Highfill and Professor Lucyle Hook are currently engaged in writing a biographical dictionary of London stage performers, 1660-1800.

Recev'd [sic] 3 Days²——
 Princesses³——

Recev'd 3 Days——

Rec:^d 4 Days——

Giffard open'd V: T⁵——

Recev'd 4 Days——

Boulby play'd Amanda⁶——
 Phillip's Danc'd⁷——

Recev'd 4 Days—King &c⁸
 Cibber ill¹⁰——

Prince & Princess of Wales & Chil^{d11}

Rec:^d 5 Days Cibber play'd¹³——

Woffington play'd¹⁴—— Prince of W¹⁵——

for Plowman¹⁶——

Began to Play
at Covent Garden¹
Sep : 19th 1740

1	Fri	19 th	[The] Rehearsal & [The] Dragon [of Wantley]	100
2	Mon	22	[The] Provok'd & [sic] Hus[ban] ^d & [The] M[ock] : D[octo] ^r	080
3	Wed	24	[The] Committee & [The Cheats of] Scapin	070
4	Fry	26	Macbeth	070
5	Mon	29	[The] D[ouble] : Dealer & M : D ^r	100
October				
6	Wed	1 st	[The] D[ouble] : Gallant & [The] Tanner [of York]	070
7	Fry	3	[The] Royal Merch[an] ^t & Scapin	050
8	Mon	6	[The] Fop's Fortune ⁴ & Tanner	080
9	Wed	8	[The] Pro[vok'] ^d Wife & M : D ^r	060
10	Fry	10	Rule a Wife [and Have a Wife] & Orpheus [and Eurydice]	130
11	Sat	11	[The] Tender Husband & D[itt] ^o	070
12	Mon	13	[The] Busie Body & D ^o	060
13	Wed	15	[The] Mistake & D ^o	070
14	Th	16	[A] Duke and no Duke & D ^o	050
15	Fry	17	[The] Drummer & D ^o	050
[f. 4]				
16	Sat	18	Rehearsal & D ^{to}	080
17	Mon	20	[The] Fair Quaker [of Deal] & D ^o	070
18	Tues	21	Wit without Money	060
19	Wed	22	Love's Last Shift & [Harlequin Dr.] Faustus	050
20	Th	23	[The] Conscious Lovers & S[chool]. Boy	050
21	Fry	24	Hamlet	030
22	Sat	25	Busie Body & Barberini danc'd ⁹	200
23	Mon	27	[The] Way o' y ^e World & D ^o	100
24	Tus	28	P. Husband & D ^o	100
25	Wed	29	The London Cuckolds	130
26	Th	30	Duke and no Duke & Orpheus	220
27	Fry	31	[The Death of] Alexander [the Great] ¹² & Dragon	050
Nov ^r				
28	Sat	1 st	[A Trip to the] Jubilee & S. Boy	080
29	Mon	3 ^d	Rehearsal & Scapin	060
30	Tus	4 th	Tamerlane & Faustus	075
31	Wed	5 th	Macbeth & D ^o	030
32	Th	6 th	[The] Rec[rutin] ^g Officer & The What d'ye call it	200
[f. 5]				
33	Fry	7 th	[The] Orphan and Tanner	150

Rece^d: 6 Days—————

Barbarini sick Duke & Princesses¹⁷—————

Rece^d: 6 Days—————

for Dormer¹⁸—————

Prince of W¹⁹————— for Cap: Peddio²⁰—————

Rec'd 6 Days—————

Prince of W²²—————

King²³—————

Rec^d: 6 Days—————

Duke &c²⁴—————

Rec^d: 6 Days—————

Never acted there before—————

Duke &c—————

a Benefit²⁵—————

Rec^d: 6 Days————— not acted these 13 years—————

M^{rs}. Barbier²⁷ sung (hiss'd) Prince of W²⁸—————

Cibber sick. I did Bayes³⁰—————

a Benefit³¹—————

Rec^d: 4 Days—————

for Oates³²—————

Play'd at Drury Lane³³—————

Rec^d: 2 Days—————

COURSE OF PLAYS, 1740-2

439

34	Sat	8 th	Recr ^d Officer and Dragon	190
35	Mon	10 th	D ^{to} & [The] Honest Yorkshireman	110
36	Tus	11 th	D ^o & Tanner	080
37	Wed	12 th	F : Quaker & Orpheus	100
38	Th	13 th	D : Gallant	100
39	Fry	14	[The] Funeral & Orpheus	080
40	Sat	15	Country Lasses & Dragon	100
41	Mon	17	Rehearsal & Orpheus	100
42	Tus	18	Conscious Lovers & M : D ^r	170
43	Wed	19	Recruiting Officer & S. Boy	120
44	Th	20	Cato	350
45	Fry	21	Jubilee ²¹	180
46	Sat	22	Ditto	140
47	Mon	24	D ^o	100
48	Tus	25	D ^o & Dragon	120
49	Wed	26	D ^o	100
50	Th	27	D ^o	[f. 6] 200
51	Fry	28	D ^o	110
52	Sat	29	D ^o	100
Dec ^r				
53	Mon	1	D ^o	100
54	Tus	2	D ^o	080
55	Wed	3	Rehearsal & Orpheus	110
56	Th	4	Wit without Money	070
57	Fry	5	[The] Spanish Fryar	100
58	Sat	6	D : Gallant & Orpheus	110
59	Mon	8	Rule a Wife & D ^o	080
60	Tus	9	Jubilee	110
61	Wed	10	Alchymist	070
62	Th	11	Spanish Fryar	100
63	Fry	12	Provok'd Husband & Dragon	060
64	Sat	13	Double Falsehood ²⁶	130
65	Mon	15	D ^o	035
66	Tus	16	Country Lasses pan & Syrinx ²⁹	100
67	Wed	17	Spanish Fryar Pan & Syrinx	[f. 7] 090
68	Th	18	Rehearsal & Orpheus	090
69	Fry	19	Careless Husband	060
70	Sat	20	Constant Couple	100
71	Mon	22	Love's Last Shift	100
—	Tus	23		
72	Fry	26	Royal Merchant & Orpheus	120
73	Sat	27	Busie Body & D ^o	100

Prince of W³⁵———
 Rec^d: 6 Days———

Duke &c———

Rec^d: 6 Days———
 V: T———Old Cibber play'd———for Chetwood³⁶———
 Prince of W———

for Porter³⁷———Duke &c———

Rec^d: 6 Days———

Rec^d: 6 Days———

a Benefit³⁹———

Porter play'd———

Rec^d: 5 Days———

Prince and Princess of W⁴⁰———

Rec^d: 5 Days———

Prince of W⁴¹———

74	Mon	29 ³⁴		
75	Tus	30	Recruit ^g Officer	100
76	Wed	31	Alchymist	070
Jan ^{ry} 1741				
77	Th	1 st	[The] London Cuck[ol] ^{ds} & Faustus	065
78	Fry	2 ^d	Fair Quaker	100
79	Sat	3 ^d	[The] Spanish Fryar	120
80	Mon	5	[The] Merry Wives [of Windsor] & Orpheus	150
81	Tus	6	Mistake & D ^o	080
			[f. 8]	
82	Wed	7	King Lear	090
83	Th	8	Spanish Fryar	090
84	Fry	9 th	Constant Couple & Orpheus	120
85	Sat	10	Provok'd Wife	050
86	Mon	12	Old Batchelor	250
87	Tus	13	D ^o	200
88	Wed	14	D ^o	150
89	Th	15	[The] Fatal Marriage	180
90	Fry	16	Merry Wives & Orpheus	090
91	Sat	17	Provok'd Husband	080
92	Mon	19	Old Batchelor & Orpheus	120
93	Tus	20	K. Lear	060
94	Wed	21	[The Beaux'] Stratagem & Merlin's Cave ³⁸	110
95	Th	22	Oroonoko & D ^o	100
96	Fry	23	Funeral & D ^o	100
97	Sat	24	Jubilee & D ^o	200
			[f. 9]	
98	Mon	26	Spanish Fryar & D ^o	100
99	Tus	27	Henry 4 th 1 p & Devil to pay	060
100	Wed	28	[The] Mourning Bride	165
101	Th	29	Greenwich Park	100
102	Sat	31	D ^o & Merlin	080
Feb :				
103	Mon	2 ^d	D ^o & D ^o	080
104	Tus	3 ^d	D ^o & D ^o	070
			A Fast Day	
105	Th	5	Mourning Bride	120
106	Fry	6	Greenwich Park & Merlin	110
107	Sat	7	[The] Gamester & D ^o	150
108	Mon	9	D ^o & D ^o	130
109	Tus	10	Merry Wives & Orpheus	140
110	Th	12	All for Love	120

Rec^d: 4 Days——King &c⁴²——

Porter play'd——

Rec^d: 4 Days——

Porter play'd——
 Prince & Children⁴³——Rec^d: 4 Days——

Prince &c——for Woffington⁴⁴——

Porter play'd——
 Rec^d: 4 Days——Prince &c for Denoyer⁴⁵——
 for Delane⁴⁶——

for Hippisley⁴⁷

for M^{rs} Horton⁴⁸——
 Rec^d: 4 Days——
 for M^r Ryan⁴⁹——

last time of M^{rs} Porter⁵⁰——
 Rec^d: 4 Days——

for Cibber⁵¹——

M^r Lacelles⁵² play'd Aboan Tickets——
 for Glover⁵³——Duke &c——
 Woff[ington]: play'd Harry——for M^{rs} Stevens⁵⁴——
 Rec^d: 6 Days——Gordon⁵⁵ had Tickets——
 for Lalauzo⁵⁶——Prince &c——
 for Hallam⁵⁷ (Mullart⁵⁸ Tick——

G: Roberts & Chambers⁵⁹——Tickets——

for Leveridge⁶¹——
 Rec^d: 6 Days. (Mason's Play)——for Bencraft⁶²——
 for Stevens⁶³——

COURSE OF PLAYS, 1740-2

443

111	Sat	14	Recruiting Officer for Barberini ⁴²	270 [f. 10]
112	Mon	16	Rehearsal & Orpheus	140
113	Tus	17	[The] Distrest Mother & [The Royal] Chace	100
114	Thu	19	D: Gallant & D ^o	100
115	Sat	21	Rehearsal & Orpheus	120
116	Mon	23	Fop's Fortune & Merlin	100
117	Tus	24	Gamester & Orpheus	100
118	Th	26	Jane Shore & Merlin	100
119	Sat	28	Duke & no D. & Perseus [and Andromeda]	170
March.				
120	Mon	2	Way of the World & M. D ^r	190
121	Tus	3	Rehearsal & Perseus	080
122	Th	5	Macbeth & Merlin	100
123	Sat	7	The Am[orous]: Widow	230
124	Mon	9	Conscious Lovers & [The] King & [the] Miller [of Mansfield]	162
125	Tus	10	Old Batchelor & T[om]. Thumb	202 [f. 11]
126	Th	12	Abra-Mule & K. & M.	160
127	Sat	14	Rehearsal & Orpheus	140
128	Mon	16	The Rover & K. & Miller	150
129	Tus	17	Spanish Fryar	180
130	Th	19	Alexander and Merlin	120
131	Sat	21	Rehearsal & Orpheus	160
(PASSION WEEK.)				
132	Mon	30	[The] Relapse & M: D ^r	230
133	Tus	31	Rehearsal & Orpheus	130
<u>APRIL.</u>				
134	Wed	1	Oroonoko & Merlin	100
135	Th	2	P. Husband	200
136	Fry	3	Jubilee & Perseus	200
137	Sat	4	Rule a Wife & Orpheus	120
138	Mon	6	Stratagem & J[ea]lous]. Farmer	160
139	Tus	7	Conscious Lovers & Tom Thumb	110 [f. 12]
140	Wed	8	D: Dealer & K. & Miller	170
141	Th	9	King John ⁶⁰ & an Epilogue in y ^e Person of Shakespear	100
142	Fry	10	Recruit ⁶ Officer	200
143	Sat	11	Old Batchelor	130
144	Mon	13	Abra-Mule & The D[evil]: to pay	160
145	Tus	14	Rehearsal & Orpheus	110

Prince up, but did not come—for Salway⁶⁴——
 (The Whim Damn'd) for M^{rs}. Vincent & Roland⁶⁵——

Rec^d: 6 Days——

for French Boy & Girl⁶⁷——

for Haughton & Bellamy⁶⁸——
 Dupre & M^r Woodward Tick. &c⁶⁹——
 for Rosco, Richardson & Delegarde⁷⁰——

Prince & Princess of W⁷¹——
 Rec^d: 6 Days for a Fam^y in Distress——
 for Neale &c⁷²——

Villeneuve & Kilby⁷³——

(the Gregorians) for James⁷⁴——

for Oates⁷⁵——

Rec^d: 6 Days——for a Person in distress——

Cross &c Tick^{ts}⁷⁶——

Box keepers——

for D^o——

for D^o——

Rec^d: 5 Days Tickets &c——

Harrington⁷⁷ &c——

Stoppelaer⁷⁸ &c Tick:——

Roberts⁷⁹ &c Tick:——

Rec^d: 4 Days { for Theobald⁸⁰
 Prince up but did
 not come }

COURSE OF PLAYS, 1740-2

445

146	Wed	15	Old Batchelor & D ^o	070
147	Th	16	Fop's Fortune & Dragon	112
148	Fry	17	Provok'd Wife and Y ^e Whim	
			a New Farce.	120
149	Sat	18	Carless Husband & a	
			New Farce call'd th ^e	130
			Sham-Conjurer ⁶⁶	
150	Mon	20	Double Gallant & a	
			New Pant[omime]: Harl[equin]: Barber	150
151	Tus	21	Rover and Sham-Conjurer	120
152	Wed	22	Love's last shift & D ^o	160
153	Th	23	Funeral & M: D ^r	160
				[f. 13]
154	Fry	24	Rehearsal & Perseus	100
155	Sat	25	Fair Quaker and D: to pay	110
156	Mon	27	Way of the World & K. & Miller	120
157	Tus	28	Spanish Fryar & Jealous Farmer	123
158	Wed	29	Rehearsal & Orpheus	140
159	Th	30	Gamester & K. Miller	150
			May	
160	Fri	1 st	The Twin Rivals & K: & Miller	112
161	Sat	2	Conscious Lovers & Dragon	060
162	Mon	4	Merry Wives & D ^o	110
163	Tus	5	Country Lasses & D. to pay	120
164	Wed	6	Busie Bodie & Tanner	100
165	Th	7	Mistake & Scapin	100
166	Fry	8	Stratagem & K. & Miller	100
167	Mon	11	Recruit ^g Officer & D ^o	100
				[f. 14]
168	Tus	12	Rule a Wife & D[amon]. & Phill[ida].	110
169	Th	14	Funeral & D ^o	120
170	Fry	15	D: Falsehood & Interlude of Sing[ing]: by Cappoccio ⁸¹ & Dorinna	100
171	Tus	19	The Rehearsal was design'd but M ^{rs} Kilby ⁸² not being able to perform in Orpheus, an Advertism ^t was put into Papers on Tuesday taking leave of the Town, and so we concluded for this Season.	
			£. S. D.	
left	Due	8 Days ⁸³	5 : 6 : 8	

COURSE OF PLAYS

1741.

M ^{rs} .	Clive.
M ^{rs} .	Woffington.
M ^{rs} .	Mills.
M ^{rs} .	Bennet.
M ^{rs} .	Cross.
M ^{rs} .	Ridout.
M ^{rs} .	Roberts.
M ^{rs} .	Butler. &c. &c.
M ^{rs} .	Macklin.

Cibber seiz'd⁸⁶ V: T—Rec^d: 3 pounds——Rec^d: 3 pounds—great rout⁸⁷: V: T—Beard play'd—Rec^d: 3 pounds——Lowe⁸⁹ play'd Mack—

Beard play'd—

Lowe play'd—Rec^d: 3 Pounds—

A List of the Company
this Season

[f. 15]

Mr Milward. Died in Feb.
Mr Delane.
Mr Cibber.
Mr Mills.
Mr Macklin.
Mr Neale.
Mr Johnson.
Mr Arthur.
Mr Havard.
Mr Winstone.
Mr Ridout.
Mr Leigh.
Mr Ward. left us in Feb.
Mr Green.
Mr Woodburn.
Mr Shepherd.
Mr Turbutt.
Mr Gray.
Mr Berry. &c. &c.

[f. 16]

Play[s] Acted at the
Theatre Royal in
Drury Lane⁸⁴
beginning Sep^r 5th
1741.

1	Sat	5 th	Love for Love & M : D ^r	120
2	Tus	8	Recruit ^r Officer & [The] Virgin [Unmask'd] &c.	105
3	Th.	10	Othello ⁸⁵ & Devil to pay	103
4	Sat	12	Love's last shift & D ^o	100
5	Tus	15	Provok'd Hus ^d & [The] Intrig[ui]n ^r Chamber- [maid] :	080
6	Th	17	[The] Miser & King & Miller	069
7	Sat	19	Hamlet & D ^o	120
8	Tus	22	Stratagem & Virgin	070
9	Th	24	[The] Beggar's Opera	130
10	Sat	26	D ^o Michells Danc'd ⁸⁸	120
11	Tus	29	D ^o	080
Oct ^r				
12	Th	1	D ^o	084
13	Sat	3	D ^o	063
14	Tus	6	Relapse & Devil to pay	110

(bad) Pinchbeck⁹⁰ play'd FalstaffRec^d: 4 Pounds————Rec^d: 6 pounds————Fausan⁹² &c Dancd————Rec^d: 6 pounds————Phillips⁹³ came over from Ireland————

Beard play'd————

Rec^d: 6 pounds————Pr : & P : of Wales⁹⁵————Rec^d: 6 Pounds————

Reviv'd————

Rec^d: 6 pounds————

fast Day

 Rec^d: 6 pounds————Prince & Princess of W⁹⁸————

15	Th	8	Mackbeth [<i>sic.</i>] & D ^o	[f. 17] 083
16	Fry	9	Henry 4 th . & Int : Chamb ^r .	082
17	Sat	10	Rule a Wife & Devil to pay	040
18	Mon	12	Comus	120
19	Tus	13	D ^o	090
20	Wed	14	D ^o	074
21	Th	15	As you like it	120
22	Fry	16	D ^o	085
23	Sat	17	D ^o	120
24	Mon	19	D ^o ⁹¹	070
25	Tus	20	Fop's Fortune & D : to pay	060
26	Wed	21	Twin Rivals	107
27	Th	22	Recruit ^g . Officer Fausan's	100
28	Fry	23	Tender Husband & D ^o	110
29	Sat	24	Relapse & D ^o	070
30	Mon	26	Othello &c	060
31	Tus	27	Love for Love &c	070
32	Wed	28	As you like it &c	110
33	Th	29	Beggar's Opera	075
34	Fry	30	Comus &c	080
35	Sat	31	Provok'd Husb ^d . & [The] Harlot's progress	070
				[f. 18]
				Nov. ^r
36	Mon	2	[The] Merchant of Venice	126
37	Tus	3	D ^o	118
38	Wed	4	Tamerlane ⁹⁴ & Har : progress	136
39	Th	5	D ^o & D ^o	100
40	Fry	6	Love for Love &c	150
41	Sat	7	Merch ^t . of Venice	100
42	Mon	9	Miser &c	070
43	Tus	10	As you like it &c	100
44	Wed	11	[The] Comedy of Errors ⁹⁶ & [The] Fortune-tellers }	093
45	Th	12	D ^o & D ^o	090
46	Fry	13	D ^o & Dancing	100
47	Sat	14	D ^o & Fortune-tellers	070
48	Mon	16	Julius Cesar [<i>sic.</i>] & D ^o	080
49	Tus	17	Merch ^t . of Venice	090
50	Wed	18	Hamlet &c	108
51	Th	19	Comus	070
52	Fry	20	Provok'd Wife &c	104
53	Sat	21	Rehearsal ⁹⁷	090
54	Mon	23	D ^o	106
				[f. 19]
55	Tus	24	D ^o	060
56	Th	26	D ^o	110

Rec^d 5 pounds—Duke & Princesses⁹⁹—
 Old Cibber play'd Brute¹⁰⁰—
 V: T—

V: T—
 V: T—Fletewood's Tryal¹⁰¹—
 Rec^d 6 pounds—

Rec^d 6 pounds—
 V: T—sent word at 12 o'Clock (Princesses)—
 Clive play'd¹⁰²—

Xmas—

Rec^d 6 pounds.

Rec^d 4 Pounds—

Rec^d 6 pounds—

Rec^d 6 pounds—

COURSE OF PLAYS, 1740-2

451

57	Fry	27	D ^o & Fortune-tellers	060
58	Sat	28	As you like it &c	100
59	Mon	30	Macbeth &c	085
Decem ^r				
60	Tus	1	Beggar's Opera	050
61	Wed	2	Merch ^t of Venice &c	130
62	Th	3	Provok'd Wife	182
63	Fry	4	Rehearsal & Harl :	090
Shipwreck'd				
64	Sat	5	Recruiting Officer & D ^o	100
65	Mon	7	D : Gallant & D ^o	080
66	Tus	8	Cato & D ^o	040
67	Wed	9	Stratagem & D ^o	060
68	Th	10	Comedy of Errors & D ^o	040
69	Fry	11	Fop's Fortune & D ^o	070
70	Sat	12	Busie Body & D ^o	060
71	Mon	14	Distrest Mother & Fausan	083
				[f. 20]
72	Tus	15	Recruiting Officer & D ^o	060
73	Wed	16	Spanish Fryar &	060
Harl : Shipwreck'd				
74	Th	17	Twin Rivals &c	062
75	Fry	18	Busie Body &c	070
76	Sat	19	Rich[ar] ^d 3 ^d & H : Ship :	080
77	Mon	21	As you like it &c	100
78	Tus	22	Merchant of Venice &c	050
79	Wed	23	Relapse & Shipwreck	070
80	Sat	26	Rehearsal & H : Ship	072
81	Mon	28	Rich ^d 3 ^d & Fausan	080
82	Tus	29	Beggar's Opera & H : Ship	070
83	Wed	30	Comus &c	100
84	Th	31	Hamlet & H : Ship	070
Jan ^r 174 ¹ / ₂				
85	Fry	1	Miser &c	073
86	Sat	2	Comus	060
87	Mon	4	Jubilee	150
88	Tus	5	D ^o & Shipwreck	090
89	Wed	6	Committee &c	060
				[f. 21]
90	Th	7	Constant Couple &c	100
91	Fry	8	Provok'd Wife & H : Ship :	060
92	Sat	9	Committee &c	065
93	Mon	11	Merchant of Venice &c	100
94	Tus	12	Beggar's Opera & H : Ship	056

Rec^d: 6 pounds—Duke &c.¹⁰³—
 Prince of W¹⁰⁴—
 Never acted before¹⁰⁵—

Rec^d: 6 pounds Cibber read Hamlet¹⁰⁶

for Sig^r Fausan
 V: T—

Duke &c—

Milw[ar]^d: dy'd¹⁰⁷—Rec^d: 5 pounds.
 Prince of Wales &c

Milw^d: Bury'd—Rec^d: 6 pounds—Duke &c—

Duke of Sax Gotha¹⁰⁸—

V: T. M^{rs}. Woff—fainted¹⁰⁹—

Rec^d: 6 pounds—Duke &c—

Duke &c —for Sig^r Fausan¹¹⁰—

Rec^d: 6 pounds—

95	Wed	13	Provok'd Wife &c	100
96	Th	14	Jubilee &c	090
97	Fry	15	Comus	060
98	Sat	16	As you like it & H : Ship :	060
99	Mon	18	Jubilee &c	110
100	Tus	19	Love for Love & H : Ship :	050
101	Wed	20	Spanish Fryar &c	080
102	Th	21	Jubilee &c	120
103	Fry	22	All's well that end's well	090
104	Sat	23	Beggar's Opera	040
105	Mon	25	Rehearsal &c	060
106	Tus	26	Hamlet & H : Ship	050
107	Wed	27	Busie Body &c	060
108	Th	28	Committee & D : to pay	045
109	Fry	29	Tender Husband	065

[f. 22]

Feb^y

110	Mon	1	Miser &c	173
111	Tus	2	Recruit ^g Officer & H : Ship :	062
112	Wed	3	Stratagem &c	060
113	Th	4	Double Gallant &c	100
114	Fry	5	Distrest Mother & D : to pay	045
115	Sat	6	Rehearsal &c	030
116	Mon	8	Recruit ^g Officer &c	160
117	Tus	9	Comus &c	060
118	Wed	10	Busie Body &c	090
119	Th	11	[Volpone ; or, The] Fox & H : Ship	060
120	Fry	12	[The] Alchymist &c	080
121	Sat	13	[The] Silent Woman	070
122	Mon	15	Relapse & H : Shipw ^d	105
123	Tus	16	All's well that ends well &	100

Harlot's progress

124	Wed	17	Alchymist & H : Ship	045
125	Th	18	Tender Husband &c	080
126	Fry	19	All's well that ends well	110
127	Sat	20	D ^o — & Fortune-tellers	060

[f. 23]

128	Mon	22	D ^o — &c.	080
129	Tus	23	D ^o — & H : Ship ^d	065
130	Wed	24	P. Wife &c	160
131	Th	25	All's well & Fortune-tellers	
132	Fry	26	D ^o — &c	
133	Sat	27	D ^o — &c	

March.

134	Mon	1	Recruit ^g Officer &c	100
135	Tus	2	Fop's Fortune & D : to pay	070

LENT—

for Clive—
 for Wid : Milward¹¹¹—
 Duke &c—

Rec^d 6 pounds—M^r Hill play'd Constant¹¹³—
 for Delane—
 for M^{rs} Roberts¹¹⁴

for M^{rs} Cibber¹¹⁶—
 for Woffington¹¹⁷—

Duke &c—Hill play'd Carlos—
 for Macklin¹¹⁹—
 for M^{rs} Butler

for Beard—

Cibber elop'd¹²¹—for W^m Mills—
 for Pierson¹²²—
 for Mon : Michel¹²³—
 Rec^d at times £. 6 : 10—

for M^{rs} Macklin¹²⁴ —
 for M^r Lowe—
 for M^{rs} Mills—

for Mon : Mulment [sic]

for M^r Berry—
 for M^r Phillips & Walter¹²⁶—

Shepherd & Winstone—
 for Miss Cibber¹²⁷—
 for Neale & Desse—
 for Turbut & Liviez—

for Wid : Harper¹²⁸—
 for Havard &c¹²⁹—

COURSE OF PLAYS, 1740-2

455

136	Th	4	Cato &c	110
137	Sat	6	Merchant of Venice &c	110
138	Mon	8	[The] Man of Mode & V : unmask'd	230
139	Tus	9	As you like it	230
140	Th	11	D ^o &c	070
An Oratorio for Arne ¹¹² _____				
141	Sat	13	Provok'd Wife &c	120
142	Mon	15	Hamlet & Virgin	140
143	Tus	16	Relapse & D : to pay	130
144	Th	18	Merch ^t of Venice & H : Ship ^d	100
An Oratorio ¹¹⁵ &c				
145	Sat	20	Careless Husband & M : D ^r —	[f. 24] 150
146	Mon	22	[The] Confederacy & D ^o	170
147	Tus	23	All's well that ends well & Harl : Shipwreck'd	040
148	Th	25	Fop's Fortune	080
149	Sat	27	Old Batchelor ¹¹⁸ & D : to pay	150
150	Mon	29	Double Dealer & T : Thumb	123
151	Tus	30	Double Gallant & The Lottery	140
April.				
152	Th	1	Comus & M : D ^r —	207
153	Sat	3	Confederacy & Potier[sic.] &c ¹²⁰ Danc'd	100
154	Mon	5	Conscious Lovers & M : D ^r —	188
155	Tus	6	Man of Mode & M : D ^r —	190
156	Th	8	As you like it & Virgin	110
157	Sat	10	Stratagem & Poitiers	080
Passion Week.				
158	Mon	19	Macbeth & Poitier's	040
159	Tus	20	Committee & Crenon ^{s 125}	150
160	Wed	21	Love for Love & D : to pay	180
161	Th	22	Careless Husband & D ^o _____	120
162	Fry	23	Merchant of Venice & K : & Miller	[f. 25] 130
163	Sat	24	Henry 8 th & Virgin &c	130
164	Mon	26	Recruiting Officer & [The] Cooper [Outwitted ; or, Harlequin Happy]	170
165	Tus	27	1 st p : Henry 4 th & M : D ^r _____	120
166	Wed	28	The Orphan & K : Miller	078
167	Th	29	Provok'd Wife & K : & Miller	140
168	Fry	30	Rich ^d 3 ^d & D ^o	150
May.				
169	Sat	1	Miser & D ^o	050
170	Mon	3	Hamlet & D ^o	070

for a Distrest Citizen¹³⁰_____

I had Tickets¹³² &c_____

Duke &c Garrick play'd_____for Wid : Harper¹³³_____

Lacy play'd¹³⁴_____

for Doorkeepers¹³⁵_____

for Doorkeepers &c¹³⁶_____

for Baker¹³⁷_____

for Bradshaw¹³⁸_____

for the Author¹³⁹_____

Rec^d: 2 pounds—Raftor had Tickets¹⁴⁰_____

for Hobson¹⁴¹_____

Rec^d: 2 pounds 2 Shill—for Doorkeepers¹⁴²_____

for Numbers &c¹⁴³_____

Garrick play'd¹⁴⁴_____

for Taylor¹⁴⁵_____

Garrick play'd_____

D^o: play'd—Duke &c—D^o_____

COURSE OF PLAYS, 1740-2

457

171	Tus	4	Cato & D ^o	080
172	Th	6	Othello & Miss Lucy in Town ¹³¹	070
173	Fry	7	Merch. ^t of Venice & D ^o	100
174	Sat	8	Stratagem & K : & Miller	105
175	Mon	10	Recruit ^g Officer & Lucy &c	020
176	Tus	11	Orphan & D : to pay	240
177	Wed	12	Oroonoko & Lucy in Town	040
178	Th	13	Tender Husband & K : & Miller	100
				[f. 26]
179	Fry	14	Beggar's Opera & Lucy &c	100
180	Sat	15	Comus & M : D ^r	100
181	Mon	17	P. Husband & K : & Miller	080
182	Tus	18	Fop's Fortune & V : unmask'd	100
183	Wed	19	Miser & Miss Lucy	040
184	Th	20	As you like it & D ^o	080
185	Sat	22	Conscious Lovers &	170
			Virgin unmask'd	
186	Mon	24	Provok'd Wife & K : & Miller	120
187	Tue	25	Love for Love & D ^o	160
188	Wed	26	Rehearsal	150
189	Th	27	Man of Mode & K : & Miller	170
190	Fry	28	K. Lear	160
191	Mon	31	Rich. ^d 3 ^d	171
				[f. 27]

Recev'd [sic] of Ch^s Fletewood Esq^r
at times since the House Shut up.¹⁴⁶

	£.	S.	D.
June 11 th _____	1	:	1 : 0
July 13 th _____	1	:	1 : 0
August 12 th _____	1	:	1 : 0

NOTES

¹ Covent Garden was late in opening its season, 1740-1. Drury Lane had already opened with *Hamlet* on Saturday, 6 September 1740, and performed five nights, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18 September.

² Payment of salaries due Richard Cross. This included not only his wages as prompter, but also the salary of his wife Frances, a member of the acting company. Each appears to have been articulated for a wage of 6s. 8d. per day (plus a joint benefit), making a total of £2 for this three-day period.

³ A Command Performance for the Princesses Amelia, Caroline, and Louisa.

⁴ Colley Cibber's *Love Makes a Man ; or, The Fop's Fortune*.

⁵ Henry Giffard (1694-1772) managed the theatre in Goodman's Fields. This non-Patent ("minor") playhouse was to reach its zenith this season. Giffard's opening bill was *The Beaux' Stratagem* and other entertainments described in the press as follows: "Last Night the late Theatre in Goodman's Fields open'd with a Concert of Vocal and Instrumental Musick, with which was presented (gratis) the *Stratagem*. The whole was conducted with great Decency, and met with unusual Applause, and will be again perform'd this Evening, with the Addition of the *Mock Doctor*" (*The Daily Advertiser*, 16 October 1740). The curious symbol "V: T" distinguishes this manuscript from the other Cross Diaries and is used ten times in the two seasons before us. Elsewhere I have interpreted it to mean "Various Tickets" or "Various persons had Tickets", meaning that the house was either "papered" on these nights to bolster attendance, or that the management distributed tickets for sale widely among the company as a special benefit effort. (See Notes 36 and 86.)

⁶ I have been unable to identify this name.

⁷ A celebrated dancer often called "Harlequin" Phillips. William Phillips (1699-1768) was a rival of Henry Woodward.

(See Henry Fielding, *Apology for the Life of Theophilus Cibber*, 1740, p. 84.)

⁸ Command performance. The royal party is unlisted in announcements of the day.

⁹ Signora Barberini, *premier danseuse* at Covent Garden.

¹⁰ Cibber, Jr., was cast as Witwoud and so announced in the bills. The rôle was played in all probability by the prompter, Richard Cross.

¹¹ Command performance for Frederick and Augusta and their six children, Augusta, George, Edward, William, Henry, and Caroline.

¹² Nathaniel Lee's *The Death of Alexander the Great : or, The Rival Queens*. The play is better known by the short titles *Alexander or Rival Queens*.

¹³ Theophilus Cibber played Beau Clincher in *The Constant Couple : or, A Trip to the Jubilee*, and *The School Boy*.

¹⁴ Margaret Woffington's début in a Patent theatre was graced by the presence of Frederick, Prince of Wales, and a box office gross of £200. Her triumph was assured this night and throughout the season. She played *Sylvia* on the following Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday nights to a gross of £380, then turned to other rôles which never grossed less than £100 a night.

¹⁵ A Command performance.

¹⁶ A benefit for Henry Plowman. "At the Desire of several Ladies. For the Benefit of Mr. HENRY PLOWMAN . . . The ORPHAN. *Written by the late Mr. OTWAY* : and the Part of the Chaplain (by particular Desire) to be attempted by Mr. Plowman" (*The Daily Advertiser*, Friday, 7 November 1740). This gentleman's "attempt" evidently made only a slight impression. We hear no more of him in subsequent nights.

¹⁷ Command performance for William, Duke of Cumberland, and the Princesses Amelia, Caroline, and Louisa.

¹⁸ I have been unable to identify this name.

¹⁹ Command performance for the Prince of Wales and entourage.

²⁰ Captain John Peddie. "At the particular Desire of several eminent MERCHANTS. For the Benefit of the brave and unfortunate Capt. JOHN PEDDIE. Of the Prince of Orange

. . . CATO." "With several Entertainments as expressed in the great Bills. Pit and Boxes will be laid together. . . ." (*The Daily Advertiser*, 20 November 1740.)

²¹ *The Constant Couple : or, A Trip to the Jubilee.*

²² Command performance.

²³ Command performance.

²⁴ William, Duke of Cumberland, and party.

²⁵ "Benefit of Dupre, Mrs. Prince, Mrs. Gould" (*Winston MS.*, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.). James Dupre (fl. 1733-42) was a prominent dancer at Covent Garden for almost a decade. His death may be presumed as before 22 December 1742, on which night the "Widow" Dupre had benefit tickets.

²⁶ Lewis Theobald's *The Double Falsehood ; or, The Distress'd Lovers.*

²⁷ No first name known (d. 1737). According to Charles Beecher Hogan, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 1701-1800, Mrs. Barbier took benefits at Lincoln's Inn Fields 17 March 1719, and 18 March 1728.

²⁸ Command performance.

²⁹ Lewis Theobald's opera in one act, termed a "Masque" in *The Daily Advertiser*, 16 December 1740.

³⁰ The single clue to the compiler's identity. Arguing from evidence of theatrical history, I have demonstrated that only Richard Cross could have substituted for Cibber, Jr., this night (see *Introduction* to this work. For complete details see Pedicord, op. cit. pp. 505-13).

³¹ The *Covent Garden Account Book* in Folger Shakespeare Library lists this night as a benefit for Mr. Turner, receipts £19 14s. 0d. and £42 3s. 0d. I have been unable to identify this name. There is no Turner on the Covent Garden roster in this season. Turner may have been a minor playhouse functionary.

³² James Oates, Sr. This is possibly the actor mentioned by William Chetwood as acting with Ashbury c.1715. His son James Oates died in 1751 according to Charles Beecher Hogan.

³³ It would appear that this statement refers to the entire company at Covent Garden, since there is no record in calendars or daily newspapers of any performance this evening except that

of *As You Like It* at Drury Lane. Otherwise one might suppose the prompter had been borrowed by the rival company for that night—not a very plausible explanation.

³⁴ While the Rylands MS. shows a “blank” for this night, bills in the newspapers announced *The Constant Couple, With Dr. Faustus* (*The Daily Advertiser*, 29 December 1740). (See also *Winston MS.* and John Genest, op. cit. iii. 634.) Gross receipts this night amounted to £120 1s. 0d., according to the *Covent Garden Account Books* at Folger Library, Washington, D.C.

³⁵ Command performance.

³⁶ The second appearance of the symbol “V: T”. The night is a benefit for William Chetwood, former prompter at Drury Lane. The purpose is described in the newspaper bill as: “For the Relief of Mr. CHETWOOD, Late Prompter at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane, and now a Prisoner in the King’s Bench. . . . The OLD BATCHELOR. The part of FONDLEWIFE by Mr. Cibber Senior. And Laetitia by Mrs. WOFFINGTON; all the other Parts as usual. With Entertainments of Dancing by Mons. and Mademoiselle Mechel, the French Boy and Girl. With an occasional Epilogue, upon Himself, spoken by Mr. CIBBER. For the Accomodation of such Persons as could not be supplied with Places this Day, the same Play, &c. will be repeated Tomorrow” (*The Daily Advertiser*, 12 January 1741).

³⁷ For the benefit of the ageing star Mrs. Mary Ann Porter (d. 1765). The full bill for this night included Southern’s *The Fatal Marriage*, dancing, and the musical interlude *Nancy; or, The Parting Lovers*, by Henry Carey (*The Daily Advertiser*, 15 January 1741).

³⁸ *The Royal Chace; or, Merlin’s Cave*, a pantomime by Edward Phillips.

³⁹ A benefit for Thomas Lascelles (*Folger Covent Garden List*). Hogan lists this benefit for “A Person under misfortunes” (see note 52).

⁴⁰ Command performance.

⁴¹ Command performance.

⁴² For the benefit of Signora Barberini, a command performance.

⁴³ Command performance. It is interesting to note how often upon such occasions the bill is made up of Nahum Tate's *A Duke and No Duke* and a spectacle such as *Orpheus*, or as in this instance, Lewis Theobald's *Perseus and Andromeda*; or, *The Cheats of Harlequin*.

⁴⁴ For the benefit of Margaret Woffington, by command of the Prince of Wales.

⁴⁵ Command performance for M. G. Desnoyer, dancer (fl. 1733). "*By Command of their Royal Highnesses Prince GEORGE and the Lady AUGUSTA. For the Benefit of Mons. DESNOYER . . . a Comedy, call'd The AMOROUS WIDOW. With Entertainments of Dancing by Mons. Desnoyer and Sig. Barberini*" (*The Daily Advertiser*, 7 March 1741).

⁴⁶ A benefit for Dennis Delane (d. 1750).

⁴⁷ A benefit for John Hippisley (d. 1748), a sterling Shakespearean clown, who played Fondlewife in *The Old Batchelor* and composed and spoke a "new Epilogue" to the comedy, concluding the evening's labour by presenting his son Master John Hippisley (d. 1767) as Tom Thumb in the farce of that name. (See *The Daily Advertiser*, 9 March 1741.)

⁴⁸ A benefit for Mrs. Christina Horton (1696 ?-1756 ?)

⁴⁹ A benefit for Lacy Ryan (1694 ?-1760), engaged not only in the acting company but also performing the duties of John Rich's "stage-deputy" or stage manager.

⁵⁰ The last performances of Mrs. Mary Porter for this season. Her farewell to the stage took place at Covent Garden, 10 April 1742, when she played Zara in Congreve's *The Mourning Bride*.

⁵¹ A benefit for Theophilus Cibber.

⁵² A benefit ? Cross notes Thomas Lascelles's name and the usual uncertain term "Tickets". Lascelles appears to have ended his acting career in 1742. Hogan spells the name "Lascells".

⁵³ Mr. Glover's first name is unknown. He appeared as a dancer at Covent Garden as early as 1734, and according to Hogan played a benefit performance of *Henry IV* on 17 April of that year. *The Daily Advertiser*, 2 April 1741, announced among other divertisements at Covent Garden Theatre during the performance of *The Provok'd Husband*, a "new serious

Ballet, by Mr. Glover and Madem. Mechel. . . ." This night was a command performance.

⁵⁴ A benefit for Mrs. Stevens, first name unknown.

⁵⁵ A benefit for Mr. Gordon, first name unknown. This might possibly be a singer with Italian training mentioned by Martin Burns in his *Allan Ramsay, a study of his life and works* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931) who tried to establish a pastoral opera in Edinburgh in 1722.

⁵⁶ A benefit for M. Lalauze, first name unknown. He was a singer, dancer, and general performer.

⁵⁷ A benefit for Lewis Hallam (1714-56) who was later (1752) to invade the American scene at Williamsburg, Va., and to build the first theatre in New York City.

⁵⁸ William Mullart (fl. 1730) evidently shared Hallam's benefit.

⁵⁹ A benefit for Mrs. E. Roberts and Mrs. Chambers. Cross has written "G:" Roberts, but the *Covent Garden List* at Folger Shakespeare Library has "E." Mrs. Roberts was the wife of John Roberts (fl. 1723-45) and became involved in financial altercations with Manager Fleetwood, prompting the anonymous pamphlets *The Disputes*, 1744, and a defence of the actress in *An Impartial Examen*, 1744. Mrs. Chambers, whose first name is unknown, was a singer who became famous in later years for her Polly Peachum. See *The Present State of the Stage*, 1753.

⁶⁰ While it is not so noted by Cross, this night was a benefit for R. Bridgewater (see *Folger Covent Garden List*). He was a dependable actor of secondary rôles in Shakespeare and other authors.

⁶¹ A benefit for Richard Leveridge (d. 1758), the most formidable rival of John Beard in singing rôles. His name is often linked with those of Salway and Mrs. Lampe in entr'acte features.

⁶² A benefit for James Bencraft (d. 10 January 1765). Bencraft was the husband of Henrietta Rich, a capable comic actor, and prominent in Masonic gatherings of all kinds. "For the Entertainment of the GRAND MASTER, and the rest of the BRETHREN of the Ancient and Honourable Society of FREE and ACCEPTED MASONS. For the Benefit of Mr. BENCRAFT

. . . THE OLD BATCHELOR. . . . With a proper PROLOGUE and EPILOGUE. And the Songs in MASONRY as usual. . ." (*The Daily Advertiser*, 10 April 1741).

⁶³ A benefit for Stevens (fl. 1737-42), first name unknown, an actor with a lengthy career at Covent Garden Theatre.

⁶⁴ A benefit for Thomas Salway (d. 1743). This actor gained recognition as Moore of Moore-Hall, as a specialty singer, and as a comic in Shakespearean plays.

⁶⁵ A benefit for Mlle. Catherine Roland and Mrs. Vincent, first name unknown. Catherine Roland was a pupil of the famous French master, Michael Poitier (see Henry Fielding, op. cit. p. 84).

⁶⁶ A benefit for Mrs. Isabella Lampe (d. 1795) and a Miss Young, whose first name is not known (fl. 1741). This person may have been either Miss Cecilia Young who married Thomas Augustine Arne, or a younger sister, Esther Young, a mezzo-soprano at The Haymarket by 1739. Mrs. Lampe and Miss Cecilia Young were both soprano singers at The Haymarket by 1739, well-known in 1740-2. Mrs. Lampe was the wife of John Frederick Lampe, musician and composer of such pieces as *Pyramis and Thisbe* (Covent Garden, 25 January 1745).

⁶⁷ See note 88.

⁶⁸ A benefit for G. Haughton (fl. 1733-8) and Miss Bellamy. It is unlikely that this particular Miss Bellamy was either the famous George Anne Bellamy (c. 1727-d. 1788) or the one who later became known as Mrs. Walter. The former made her début at Covent Garden as Prue in *Love for Love*, 27 March 1742; the latter bowed as Angelina in *Love Makes a Man* at Covent Garden 2 October 1741.

⁶⁹ This must have been a benefit for James Dupre (fl. 1730-48) and Henry Woodward (1717-77). See note 25.

⁷⁰ A benefit for James Rosco (fl. 1730-48), Thomas Richardson (d. 1753), and M. Delagarde. Rosco was an actor of many rôles, particularly Shakespearean. Richardson was a minor actor of "utility" rôles. Delagarde was a dancer of note at Covent Garden for many years and listed for pantomimes even in the late 1750's.

⁷¹ A command performance?

⁷² A benefit for Richard Neale (fl. mid-century).

⁷³ A benefit for M. Villeneuve, a dancer, and Mrs. Elizabeth Kilby. Mrs. Kilby was a fine singer who later became the wife of actor William Havard.

⁷⁴ A benefit for Harris James (d. 15 October 1751). *The Daily Advertiser*, 29 April 1741, announced the night "For the Entertainment of the Grand, the Vice-Grand, and the Brethren of the Antient and Honourable Order of Gregorians. For the Benefit of Mr. JAMES . . . The GAMESTER" etc. The "Gregorians" were members of an association established early in the eighteenth century in ridicule of and in opposition to Freemasonry. A feud developed between the two Orders and the Gregorians were discountenanced. "They lasted, however, at least to the end of the century, for there is extant a Sermon preached before them in 1797. They must too, by that time, have changed their character, for Prince William Frederick of Gloucester was then their presiding officer; and Dr. Munkhouse, the author of that sermon . . . speaks in high terms of the Order as an ally of Freemasonry, and distinguished for its benign tendency and salutary effects" (*Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, Philadelphia, 1917).

⁷⁵ A benefit for James Oates (d. 1751). This is Oates, Jr. (See note 32.)

⁷⁶ A benefit "For Cross, prompter, Anderson, Clark, and White". (See Charles Beecher Hogan, *op. cit.* i. 59.)

⁷⁷ I have been unable to identify this name.

⁷⁸ Michael Stoppelaer (fl. 1730-).

⁷⁹ A benefit for John Roberts (fl. 1723-45), a good Shakespearean actor.

⁸⁰ A benefit for Lewis Theobald, author of *The Double Falsehood*.

⁸¹ I have been unable to identify these singers.

⁸² Mrs. Kilby's indisposition left the company without a first-rate voice for the afterpiece, with which the company had to attract its audience so late in the season. It is interesting to note here that Drury Lane was able to play ten more nights, closing its season on Monday, 4 June 1741.

⁸³ For the significance of these figures in establishing Richard Cross as compiler of the Rylands MS., see *Introduction* and

Pedicord, op. cit. p. 511, note 2. These figures represent the combined wages of Richard and Frances Cross, each having been articulated for 6s. 8d. per day, or £2 13s. 4d. every eight days.

⁸⁴ Drury Lane succeeded in securing the new star of Covent Garden, Mrs. Woffington, and opened sixteen days ahead of the rival house, 1741-2. After a night in which to reintroduce Theophilus Cibber, Drury Lane brought forward its acquisition as Sylvia in *The Recruiting Officer*, Woffington's début rôle at Covent Garden. When John Rich finally opened his season, he tried the competition with the début of Hannah Pritchard in Woffington's rôle as Sylvia, together with the return engagement of Chapman as Brazen. See *The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 19 September 1741.

⁸⁵ Dennis Delane's debut at Drury Lane, where he was to work for the remainder of his stage career.

⁸⁶ See notes 5 and 36. While it is still my opinion that the symbol means "Various Tickets" or "Various persons had Tickets" wherever it appears, some scholars suppose it to mean "Various Justices", connecting it with the stormy career of Theophilus Cibber. And they may be correct. My argument rests simply upon the integrity of Richard Cross as compiler of this manuscript. He would certainly have recorded particulars (with relish) of any playhouse gossip threatening decorum at Drury Lane, and upon the fact that five times in which this symbol appears have no reference to the antic Cibber, Jr. I have yet had no occasion to change my mind as to the meaning of this symbol. The seizure of young Cibber is but one of many scandalous doings in any playhouse hiring him. Note the change in Richard Cross's salary from the previous season.

⁸⁷ The "great rout", whatever its nature, could not have involved the younger Cibber on-stage this night. John Beard was the star of the evening as Macheath.

⁸⁸ A dancing family, according to *The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 25 September 1741, which promised "... dancing by Mons. and Madem MECHELL (the French Boy and Girl) being the first Time of their Appearing upon the Stage. Particularly a Pantomime Ballet call'd *The Swiss* by Mons. and Madem Mechel. Also as Peasant by Mons. Mechel." The

advertisement should have read "the first Time of their Appearing on the Drury Lane stage". These people had appeared at Covent Garden in the previous season as "the French Boy and Girl", etc.

⁸⁹ Thomas Lowe played Macheath.

⁹⁰ "The Part of FALSTAFF to be attempted by a CITIZEN of LONDON" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 8 October 1741).

⁹¹ Perhaps just another night for Drury Lane Theatre. But off in Goodman's Fields a young actor by the name of David Garrick was making stage history as King Richard III, "by a Gentleman who has never appeared on the stage before", etc.

⁹² Signor and Signora Fausan were very popular as a dance-team during 1741-3.

⁹³ A puff in *The Daily Advertiser*, 13 October 1741, insisted that "We hear that Mr. Phillips, the celebrated Dancer and Harlequin, is just arriv'd in this Kingdom, and is now on the Road to London, and intends to exhibit his extraordinary Performance at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane". This is the same dancer who graced the stage at Covent Garden the previous season. And *The London Daily Post and General Advertiser* on 29 October 1741, marks Phillips's appearance as one "Who has not appear'd upon that Stage these three Years".

⁹⁴ In celebration of the Anniversary of King William there were no less than three performances of Rowe's *Tamerlane*. In addition to the one at Drury Lane, with Milward as Tamerlane and Delane as Bajazet, Covent Garden featured Ryan's *Tamerlane* and the Bajazet of Stevens, while at Goodman's Fields Giffard played *Tamerlane* to the Bajazet of Marshall. All productions announced and featured "the usual Prologue", according to *The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*.

⁹⁵ "By Command of their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 5 November 1741). The Fausans entertained with dancing this night (*The Daily Advertiser*, 6 November 1741).

⁹⁶ "Never acted there before: By His Majesty's Company of Comedians" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 11 November 1741). Covent Garden vied with Drury Lane by

producing *The Winter's Tale* as "Never acted there before/ By the Company of Comedians."

⁹⁷ "Not acted there these Seven Years / By His Majesty's Company of Comedians" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 21 November 1741).

⁹⁸ A command performance, elicited perhaps by competition from Goodman's Fields, where Garrick's *Richard III* had been a sensation since 19 October? "Last Night there was a great Number of Persons of Quality and Distinction at the Theatre in Goodman's Fields, to see the Play of Richard the Third, who all express'd the highest Satisfaction at the whole Performance, several hundred Persons were obliged to return for want of room, the House being full soon after Five o'clock" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 27 November 1741).

⁹⁹ "By Command of their Royal Highnesses the DUKE, and the Princesses *Amelia*, *Caroline*, and *Louisa*" (ibid. 2 December 1741). But this was Garrick's benefit night and his first appearance as Lothario in *The Fair Penitent* (*The Daily Advertiser*).

¹⁰⁰ Another visit by royalty! "And tomorrow the Prince and Princess of Wales will be at Drury Lane to see the Provok'd Wife, in which Mr. Cibber, sen. is to perform Sir John Brute" (ibid. 2 December 1741).

¹⁰¹ One of the many instances in which we find this "coarser Sheridan" in the hands of money-lenders. Fleetwood sold his Patent to Green and Amber in 1744, after having sponsored the debuts of Macklin's Shylock and Garrick's first-season repertoire imported from the minor theatre.

¹⁰² "We hear that Mrs. Clive, who has been so dangerously ill that her life has been despair'd of, is now judg'd to be in a fair way of Recovery" (*The Daily Advertiser*, 16 December 1741). "Mrs. Clive, who has been lately dangerously ill at her lodgings in Great Queen-Street, is so well recovered, that she will perform this Night at the Theatre in Drury-Lane, in the famous Comedy of Shakespear's call'd *As You Like It*" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 21 December 1741).

¹⁰³ "By Command of their Royal Highnesses the DUKE, and the Princesses AMELIA, CAROLINE, and LOUISA" (ibid. 20 January 1742).

¹⁰⁴ "By Command of their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of WALES" (ibid. 21 January 1742).

¹⁰⁵ See Pedicord, op. cit. pp. 521-3.

¹⁰⁶ See ibid. p. 523.

¹⁰⁷ For an account of Milward's death see ibid. pp. 521-3.

¹⁰⁸ Ernest Augustus, Duke of Sax-Gotha.

¹⁰⁹ "Last Night, in the First Act of All's Well that End's Well, which was acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane, Mrs. Woffington was taken so violently ill, that she fainted away, as she stood in the Scenes, ready to come on: After a proper Apology being made, the Audience, with great Humanity and Patience, waited till another Person dress'd to read the Part . . ." (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 17 January 1742).

¹¹⁰ Cross's note should read Signora Fausan, according to *The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 24 February 1742, which adds that the performance is "By Command of their Royal Highnesses the DUKE, and the Princesses AMELIA, CAROLINE, and LOUISA".

¹¹¹ A benefit for the widow of William Milward and her four children. ". . . With an Epilogue to the Memory of Mr. Milward, To be Spoken by Mr. Cibber" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 9 March 1742). There is a notice in *The Daily Advertiser*, 12 March 1742, from Mary Milward, thanking the Town for its kindness to her on this benefit night.

¹¹² A benefit for Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Arne. The composer introduced this night his new setting of Congreve's *The Judgment of Paris*. The main portion of the programme was given over to a performance of *Alexander's Feast* by Dryden, set to Handel's music. (See *The Daily Advertiser*, 12 March 1742).

¹¹³ "By particular DESIRE. As November 20, 1741, except Constant a Gentleman . . . for his first appearance on any stage. Dancing by M. and Madem. Fausan, their last in England" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 13 March 1742). I have been unable to identify this actor further.

¹¹⁴ A benefit for Mrs. E. Roberts.

¹¹⁵ The oratorio was *Alexander's Feast* with *The Judgment of Paris*. "At the particular Desire of several Persons of Quality" (*The Daily Advertiser*, 19 March 1742).

¹¹⁶ While Cross lists this night as a benefit for Mrs. Cibber, the newspapers advertize the benefit for Mr. Cibber, who appeared as Lord Foppington, "With an EPILOGUE (on Petit Maitre) by Miss CIBBER" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 20 March 1742).

¹¹⁷ A benefit for Margaret Woffington. "Act V (At the particular Desire of several Ladies of Quality) Mrs. Clive will sing the celebrated Irish Ballad of Elein-a-Roon, as she perform'd it at the Theatre-Royal in Dublin" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 22 March 1742).

¹¹⁸ For the benefit of Mr. Johnson, who played Bluff that evening.

¹¹⁹ A benefit for Charles Macklin, who made his first appearance as Sir Paul that evening and also played Queen Dollalolla in *The Tragedy of Tragedies*.

¹²⁰ "Dancing by M. Poitier, Madem. Roland, Master and Miss Poitier, lately arrived from Paris" (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 3 April 1742).

¹²¹ Cibber, Jr., had been scheduled to play Tom this night. I have not discovered the particular offence in which he was involved on 5 April 1742. I suggest that he took a sudden pique against William Mills, whose benefit it was. In any event he was playing the following evening in *The Mock Doctor* (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 6 April 1742).

¹²² The treasurer of Drury Lane Theatre.

¹²³ See note 88.

¹²⁴ A benefit for Mrs. Macklin and Mrs. Elizabeth Bennet. The latter played a wide range of Shakespearean heroines and other female rôles. See *The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 20 April 1742.

¹²⁵ This is an excellent example of the perplexities of eighteenth-century "shorthand". The afterpiece was Henry Carey's *Chrononhotonthologus* (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 20 April 1742) but Cross writes quite clearly "Crenon^s".

¹²⁶ A benefit for Mr. Phillips and Mrs. Walter, who played Lucy in *The Recruiting Officer* and the Cooper's Wife in the pantomime.

¹²⁷ A benefit for Miss Cibber and her sister.

¹²⁸ Her first benefit (see Pedicord, op. cit. pp. 525-6). *The Daily Advertiser* for 30 April 1742, published "The Case of the Widow of the late Mr. Harper, Comedian", emphasizing that Harper had been incapacitated by a "Paralytick Disorder" for four years before his recent death.

¹²⁹ A benefit for Havard, Arthur, and Ridout (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 3 May 1742).

¹³⁰ "By Command of their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of WALES" (ibid. 4 May 1742).

¹³¹ *Miss Lucy in Town*, "A new Farce . . . Being the Sequel to the Virgin Unmask'd" (ibid. 6 May 1742).

¹³² See Pedicord, op. cit. This night was a benefit for Richard Cross, Demainbray (machinist) and Ray (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 8 May 1742).

¹³³ In *The Daily Advertiser*, 7 May 1742, it is stated that the Widow's benefit, because of the warm weather, brought "scarcely the Charges of the Theatre". So Garrick performed a second benefit for the Lady.

¹³⁴ Lacy played the rôle of Oroonoko. He was known as the "Inventor of the Theatre in Ranelagh Garden".

¹³⁵ A benefit for Taswell, Mayle, Gray, Mrs. King, and Mrs. Pinny (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 13 May 1742).

¹³⁶ A benefit for Barkley, Fenn, Fuller, Fulwood, Sumner (ibid. 15 May 1742).

¹³⁷ For Baker, pit doorkeeper, "late Linen-Draper in *Wood-Street*" (ibid. 17 May 1742).

¹³⁸ Bradshaw was bookkeeper at Drury Lane Theatre.

¹³⁹ Henry Fielding. Mrs. Clive spoke a new epilogue on the occasion.

¹⁴⁰ Mrs. Clive's brother, James Raftor.

¹⁴¹ Hobson was housekeeper and stage boxkeeper at Drury Lane.

¹⁴² A benefit for Stevens, Bishop, Walker, Sanders (*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 24 May 1742).

¹⁴³ The "Numbers" were Mrs. Marshall, Miss Lee, Miss Budgell, Miss Wright, Miss Cole, and Mrs. Walker (ibid. 25 May 1742).

¹⁴⁴ After the Widow Harper's benefit, when Garrick played Chamont in *The Orphan*, the young star was pencilled-in for three more "show-case" performances at this legitimate house. The first of the final trio was Bayes in *The Rehearsal*, in which he satirized most of the better legitimate performers.

¹⁴⁵ Taylor was a boxkeeper.

¹⁴⁶ Payments to Richard Cross on account of salaries for Frances Cross and himself.

THE IMAGE OF GOD:

NOTES ON THE HELLENIZATION OF JUDAISM, WITH ESPECIAL
REFERENCE TO GOODENOUGH'S WORK ON JEWISH SYMBOLS¹

By MORTON SMITH

PH.D. (HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM), TH.D. (HARVARD),
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

I. *Hellenization in Disguise*

DISCUSSIONS of the hellenization of ancient Judaism often take for granted that any material for which precedent can be found in the Old Testament is therefore independent of hellenistic influence. This supposition neglects the fact that rabbinic literature is almost entirely homiletic and legal. Preachers and lawyers must find proof-texts in certain books which are authoritative for their purposes. But they do not necessarily get their ideas from those books to which they must go for their proof-texts. The history of Biblical and legal exegesis bristles with examples of texts which have been made to bear meanings their authors never thought of. Consider two rabbinic instances: Ben Azzai uses the text, "This is the book of the generations of *Adam*", as an excuse to argue that the Law is the basic principle of *human* society. R. Jeremiah b. Le'azer uses the text, "Male and female he created *them*" as an excuse for teaching that when God created Adam he created *him* androgynous.² Clearly, it would be mistaken to say that because these rabbis found the texts in the Bible they must also have found the ideas there.

What holds for preachers and lawyers holds also for translators. The Hebrew text of the Bible is in a number of places obscure beyond understanding. Therefore any understandable

¹ The content of this paper was originally delivered in three lectures given in 1955 at the Hebrew Teachers' College, Boston.

² Siphra on Exod. xix. 18 and Bereshit Rabba viii. 1 (ed. Theodore, p. 55). On the former see my note in [*H*]arvard [*T*]heological [*R*]eview, xlviii (1955), 51.

translation of those places must be a reading into them of ideas supplied by the translator. Where the translator got his ideas is a question which cannot be settled at all by the fact that he read them into the Hebrew text. Thus when the LXX turned the obscure Hebrew, 'ehyeh 'asher 'eyheh,¹ which the Targums did not attempt to translate, into the clear Platonism, "I am the one being", then, even though the resultant Being did retain the gender of the Biblical God,² there is no doubt that we are looking at a hellenization of the Biblical religion.

Therefore it is often unjustified to cite the proof-text used by a preacher, or the LXX's remodellings of the Hebrew, as evidence that the ideas thus introduced are signs of Jewish tradition rather than hellenistic influence.

Of course, proof texts sometimes do happen to contain the ideas attributed to them. But even when they do, *the taking up and development of ideas by later writers may be evidence of outside influence.*

For example, let us consider the notion that man is made in the image of God. It appears in the Old Testament in two places in Genesis,³ in the second of which it is added as an explanation to a law making murder a capital offence. There is no doubt that in both these places the detail is, at very least, pre-

¹ Exod. iii. 14.

² Cf. J. Freudenthal, "Are There Traces of Greek Philosophy in the LXX?" [*Jewish Quarterly Review*], ii (1890), 220. F. is mistaken in supposing that *to on* is Stoic rather than Platonic and his explanation of an Alexandrian translation of the third century B.C. by the influence of Palestinian exegesis of the third century A.D. is not plausible. Note also his final argument (p. 222), "Who would venture to ascribe to the Soferim, Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan a knowledge of systems of philosophy which could only be acquired after a long devotion to their study?" No one, surely, supposes that the translators of the Old Testament were trained philosophers. But it is supposed that Greek philosophy had a large, albeit indirect, influence on the *Weltanschauung* of most thinking men (among whom were many rabbis) in the ancient world. As evidence against this latter supposition there is no importance whatever in F.'s demonstration that the translators of the LXX neglect the technical, philosophic senses of certain words. And even concerning trained philosophers, argument from this fact would be dangerous. For instance, it would prove Philo ignorant of philosophy, since, as Wolfson has shown, he is generally indifferent in his use of philosophic terms. H. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, 1947), i. 102 ff.

³ i. 26 f. and ix. 6.

exilic. Since later Biblical tradition became much opposed to physical anthropomorphism, to anything which would suggest that a statue of any sort could be in any respect a faithful likeness of the deity, it is surprising that this material survived. It is even more surprising to find it taken up by a number of rabbis and used by them not only to justify capital punishment for murder, but also to argue the dignity of man in general and to blame those who abstain from the procreation of children because they diminish the number of the images of God.¹

Now the purposes for which these rabbis used these proof texts are closely related to the culture of the Greco-Roman world. It was in that world that the notion of human dignity was given its classical development by the Stoics, and it was in that world that the practice of asceticism was spreading in the second and third centuries A.D. when these rabbis attack the consequent abstinence from procreation. So the motives of their statements are explicable by the influence of the Greco-Roman environment,² but what of the form? Why should these rabbis have chosen to rest their teaching on a proof text so apparently alien to our common notion of Jewish doctrine?

The explanation is to be found in a number of passages of the midrashim, where this thought is directly related to the contemporary importance of the images of the Greco-Roman rulers. In *Leviticus Rabba* xxxiv. 3 a story is told of Hillel. On one occasion when he was about to leave his disciples, they said to him, "' Rabbi, where are you going?' He said to them, 'To perform a commandment.' They said to him, 'What is this commandment?' He said to them, 'To bathe in the (public) bath.' They said to him, 'Is this a commandment?' He said

¹ *Tosepta Yebamot*, 8 end; cf. *Yeb.* 63b; *Abot*, 3. 14.

² This is not to say, of course, that all Jewish ascetics were necessarily imitators of Greek examples. Asceticism, like mysticism, is a psychological phenomenon which can appear in any religion, and appears in most without being the result of outside influence. What shows the influence of the surrounding world, therefore, is not the *recurrence* of asceticism, but the *increase of its importance* in the second and later centuries A.D., to which these rabbinic statements testify, and which is clearly part and parcel of the change of the Greco-Roman environment. This distinction between precedent (which is often unimportant) and active influence (which is usually contemporary) is the point to be made by this section of the paper.

to them, 'Yes. If the man who is appointed to take care of the images of kings, which are set up in theatres and circuses, scours them and rinses them, and they provide his livelihood, and not only that, but he occupies an important place among government officials; then I, who was created in the image and likeness (of God) . . . *a fortiori*.' " Substantially the same story appears in Abot de R. Nathan¹ as a comment on the words, "And let all thy acts be for the sake of Heaven".²

In the Mekilta³ we read, "The text implies that anyone who sheds blood is held to be guilty of diminishing the divine image. (Murder is thus rebellion against God, as shown by a) comparison: A human king entered a province and the citizens set up portraits of him and made images of him and struck coins (bearing) his (likeness). But after a time they overthrew his portraits and broke his images and cancelled the coins and (thus) diminished the likeness of the king. (Was not this tantamount to rebellion?). Thus anyone who sheds blood is held to be guilty of diminishing the divine image, for it is said, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made He man' " (Gen. ix. 6).

Again in Debarim Rabba⁴ the establishment of the cities of refuge is explained by the following parable: "It is like (the case of) a carver who was making an image of the king. While he was working on it, it broke in his hands. The king said, 'Had he broken it for some purpose of his own, he should have been put to death. As things are, since he broke it unintentionally, let him be condemned to the mines.' So the Holy One, Blessed be He," laid down Gen. ix. 6 as the rule and provided the cities of refuge for the exception.

Similarly, Exodus Rabba⁵ comments on the text of Gen. ix. 6 with the words, "It is like (the case of) a man who struck the image of the king and was brought into court. The king said, 'Have you not read in my ordinance that any one who touches my

¹ Text B, ch. 30, ed. Schechter, fol. 33b, now available in the translation by J. Goldin in the *Yale Judaica Series*.

² That is, of God.

³ Bahodesh, Jethro, 8, on Exod. xx. 16 (ed Lauterbach, 2. 262) repeated in Yalqut S. I. 299.

⁴ 2.21, repeated in Yalqut S. I. 829.

⁵ 30. 12 (end).

image is to be put to death. Why did you not spare yourself? ' So if a man kills a Jew it is as if he destroyed the image of a king, and he is judged and (if found guilty) has no (chance of) life, because man was created in the likeness of the ministering angels."

The conclusion of this last story is particularly interesting because Gen. ix. 6 says bluntly, " Because in the image of God He made man ", and all the rest of the above-quoted stories end with quotation of this text. Further, it is clear that the argument of the story in Exodus Rabba requires the antithesis between the king and God, not the ministering angels. So the unexpected appearance of the angels is clearly the result of a posterior revision, by which the force of the argument is weakened.¹

Another instance of such revision for the same purpose is the Targum to Ps. lxxxii. 6, which changes " I have said, ' Ye are gods, and all of you sons of the Most High ' " to, " I have said, ' Behold, you are reckoned as angels (*malakaya*), and all of you as angels (*'anglë*) of the Most High ' ". Similarly, the statement of Deut. xxxiv. 6, that the Lord buried Moses, which was taken literally by the Mishnah,² is understood later to mean that the ministering angels buried him.³ These examples, which could easily be multiplied, prove the opposition which was eventually encountered by the notion that man was the image of God. Thus they justify our surprise at seeing the notion developed by the rabbis of the Greco-Roman period, and confirm our hypothesis that such development must have been due to the influence of the cult of the statues of civil rulers.

In contrast with this later opposition, the early interpretations of Gen. i. 26 f. and ix. 6⁴ show no significant concern to palliate or

¹ It is possible that the use of the ministering angels in place of God as referents for biblical anthropomorphisms was originally a mark of an allegorizing—as opposed to a literalist—school of Palestinian exegesis. So A. Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God*, II, *Essays in Anthropomorphism* (Oxford, 1937) (*Jews' College Publications*, 14), pp. 46 ff. and 140. However, it cannot be original here, since the force of the argument depends on the parallel between the mortal and the divine rulers (*melek basar wedam v. Melek malke hammelakim*).

² Sotah 1, end.

³ Midrash Tannaïm, 3. 26 (ed. Hoffmann, p. 18).

⁴ So far as represented by the entries for these verses in A. Hyman, *Torah haḳketubah wehammesurah* (Tel Aviv, 1937-40), 3 vols.

refute these statements that man is the image of God.¹ Only with the medieval commentators do apologetic and philosophical explanations appear.² Indeed, the rabbinic tradition sometimes went to the extreme of anthropomorphism: Not only did it make the notion of man's likeness to God as physical and detailed as possible (it included circumcision among the distinguishing marks of the Deity),³ but it took the likeness as proof of the potential perfection of man and taught that Adam before the fall and the righteous in the world to come realized this perfection and were rightly, therefore, to be worshipped by the angels: We read in Baba Batra 75b, "Rabba said R. Johanan said, 'The righteous are destined to be called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, for it is said, "Everyone who is called by my name, him have I created, formed and made that he should also share my glory"'".⁴

¹ There are occasional traces of such a concern, e.g. the Jerusalem Targum adds *min qodam* between *demut* and *yahweh* in Gen. i. 27 (but it translates the relevant words literally in i. 26 and ix. 6, as do Onkelos, the LXX and the Peshitto, which also translate i. 27 literally). Contrast this indifference with the concern expressed by a long string of early comments on i. 26, to explain the plurality of "Let us make man". On the other hand, there was early and frequent opposition to anthropomorphism, see the material collected by Marmorstein, *Doctrine*, ii. 28 ff. and 54 f.—which could easily be increased. Marmorstein's supposition that in Palestinian Judaism there were two schools of thought, one which took the anthropomorphisms of the Bible literally, another which allegorized them, is not improbable, but the evidence he has advanced to identify the members of the schools is far from conclusive. He may be right in seeing a dramatization of a dispute about this matter in The Martyrdom of Isaiah (the Jewish section of the Ascension, according to Charles) where the wicked King Manasseh represents the adherents of the opinion that God is not visible.

² Beside the Miqra'ot Gedolot, ad loc., see the striking contrast in Midrash haggadol on Bereshit (ed. Margulies) between the early material on these verses and the comments of the medieval editor.

³ Wherefore Adam was created circumcized: Abot de R. Nathan, text A, 2 (6b), repeated in Yalqut S. l. 16 and 2. 261, cf. The Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus, 10 (ed. F. Conybeare, *Anecdota Oxoniensa* (Oxford, 1898), p. 7); Justin, Dialogue, 114; Baba Batra 58a and Rashi, ad loc. and the material collected by Marmorstein, *Doctrine*, ii. 50 f. Marmorstein's conclusion is (p. 52), "The material quoted . . . leaves no doubt that there was a school in Judaism, and an important one, too, that believed in a God who accompanies man in human form and shape".

⁴ Isa. xliii. 7. This translation of this and the following biblical verses is deliberately forced to indicate the interpretations put upon them by the rabbinic contexts.

"R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Johanan said, 'Three are called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, and they are these: The righteous and the Messiah and Jerusalem. The righteous, as we have just shown. The Messiah, for it is written, "And this is his name, which he will be called, The Lord Our Righteousness".¹ Jerusalem, for it is written, . . . "And as for the name of the city, the Lord is its name".'² . . . R. Elazar said, 'The trishagion will be said before the righteous as it is said before the Holy One, blessed be He'." In a later passage in the Tanhuma³ and in the condensation in Bereshit Rabbati⁴ this potential divinity and predicted worship are presented as the direct consequences of man's being the image of God. So it is in the Latin life of Eve (13 ff.), where, after Adam's creation, the angels are ordered to "worship the image of God".⁵

On the other hand, there is another passage in the Tanhuma,⁶ beginning, "The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Israel, 'I am not as flesh and blood'. A human king does not permit men to be called by his name, as you know, for whenever one man wants to accuse another he calls him Augustus so-and-so, and (effectively) kills him. But Israel are called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be He. He is called God, and He called Israel Gods, for it is written, 'I have said, "Ye are Gods"'.⁷ The concluding promise is again that of worship by the attribution of holiness, probably the recitation of the trishagion. Here the deification of the just is to be the result of their being called by the name of God and thereby identified with him in nature or office.

(Both traditions as to deification—that by form and that by name—were known to Paul, who evidently attributed considerable importance to the choice between them, for he goes out of his

¹ Jer. xxiii. 6.

² Ezek. xlvi. 3.

³ Ed. Buber, in the supplement to Shalah, 39a.

⁴ Ed. Albek, p. 19.

⁵ This notion played a large part in the Life of Adam and Eve, see Kahana's edn. 10; 33. 5; 35. 3, etc. L. Wells, in Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 137, note on ch. 12, refers to parallels from the Koran and Moses *haddarshan*.

⁶ Ed. Buber, Qedoshim, 37b.

⁷ Cf. John x. 34. The inevitable rationalizing and moralizing interpretation of such material appears in Sifre Deb. 49 (on 11. 22) and parallels. Direct opposition to the literal interpretation—which argues that there was one—appears in Bereshit Rabba 90. 2 (1100 f.) and Ruth R., Int. 1.

way to insist that although "Messiah Jesus" was "in the form of God" yet "he did not think equality with God something to be grasped at, but . . . humbled himself . . . wherefore God, in return, exalted him exceedingly and gave him, as a free gift, the name which is above every name", so that he should be worshipped by angels, men and demons, and all "should confess that Jesus, Messiah, is The Lord".¹)

For our purpose at the moment, the important thing is the agreement of both traditions in arguing from pagan practice. The first passages quoted show that the prominence given by the rabbis to the notion of man as an image of God and as a divine being to be worshipped by the angels reflects the influence of the cult of the statues of the rulers of the hellenistic world and the

¹ Phil. ii. 5-11. A similar opposition to the notion that Adam was to be worshipped by the angels as the image of God is found in Bereshit Rabba 8. 10 (63 f.). Here, as above, the worship offered to him was the trishagion. This is explained by an article by E. Peterson, *Polemik gegen die Mystiker, Ephemerides Liturgicae*, lxi. (1947), 339 f., Peterson's observations are so much in point that I summarize them here: The Qedushah in Apostolic Constitutions, 7. 35. 3 (a section of Jewish origin) is followed by a string of blessings including several which emphasize that none is holy save God. 1 Sam. ii. 2-3 is used as a proof text, and its context is a polemic against *megalorremosyne* which could be understood as referring to heretics who attributed holiness to themselves. If the prayers in Apostolic Constitutions have this polemic purpose, they follow the Qedushah because that was the favourite prayer of Jewish mystics (Elbogen, *Gottesdienst*, 19) and it was presumably such mystics who claimed such holiness. Several Jewish magical prayers (*PGM*, 1. 12, lines 196 ff.; 112, lines 1167 ff.; cf. 90, line 522) and *Poimandres* 1. 31 suggest that the recitation of the Qedushah was conceived as a means of invoking the deity or a result of union with him. The angels in *III Enoch* 35. 6 are restored to their original form by the recitation of the Qedushah; presumably the mystics held that man was, too; i.e. he became once more the image of God. Accordingly, the recitation of the Qedushah was much loved in the second century (Finkelstein, *JQR*. xvi (1925), 31) and the polemic of the Jewish source of the A.C. probably dates from that period. Thus far Peterson. Add to his evidence the polemic passages cited in the preceding note. There is an interesting parallel between *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, ed. K. Preisendanz (Leipzig, 1928 and 1931), 2 vols. (hereinafter = *PGM*), 1. 90 (no. IV, line 522): *hagiois hagiastheis hagiasmasi hagios* and the saying quoted in *Shemot Rabba* 38. 8 (of Aaron): *yabo' qadosh wayyikhanes laqqadosh wayyaqrib lipne qadosh wayyekapper 'al qedoshim*. Note also the statement in *Way. R.* 24. 8, that when the angels crown God with the triple crown of the trishagion he transfers two of the crowns to the head of Israel. The Jewish tradition as to the effect of the recitation of the trishagion deserves a special and thorough study.

Roman Empire.¹ So, too, the notion that the righteous will be deified by being given the name of God has been shown, by the last passage, to have been related by the rabbis to the deification which rhetoricians represented as effected by the imperial title. Unquestionably, both these notions had deep and ancient roots in magical practice, and certainly the Bible contained some texts which could be made to justify them. But the passages quoted argue strongly that the *development* of these notions and the *selection* of these texts was due to the influence of contemporary pagan practice.

In such instances as these the preacher who comes to the Bible looking for a proof text happens to find a good one, one which really says what he wants said. But this does not alter the fact that *he finds it because he looks for it, and he looks for it because of the practices or ideas which have become important in the world around him*. Therefore, when we discuss the influences at work on a religion we must look first of all to the world around it, its immediate environment.²

II. The Evidence

For the study of Greco-Roman Judaism it is most needful to keep all the different sorts of evidence in mind at the same time. Many works on the subject have gone astray because the authors

¹ There are many other passages in which this influence is clear, even though not explicit, e.g. Debarim Rabba, ed. Lieberman, p. 93: "R. Joshua b. Levi said, 'An angelic escort goes before a man and the criers cry out before him. And what do they say? "Make way for the image of the Holy One, blessed by He."'" This must reflect pagan practice so familiar that there was no need to specify it.

² If this principle seem a truism scarcely worth stating, the excuse for its statement may be found in the present popularity of explanations of details of Judaism by reference to the religions of ancient Syria, Egypt, Mesopotamia and Persia. Undoubtedly the Bible does show appropriation and adaptation of material from all these sources, but it is extremely implausible to attribute to *ancient* or *local* or *peripheral* influences any characteristic of Maccabean or later Judaism which can be explained by reference to the *contemporary* and *universal* and *immediate* influence of hellenistic culture. Moreover, the factor of fashion has to be considered: While the Greeks might dabble in oriental religions and, occasionally, affect native ways, the adoption of Greek ways became, for the natives, the height of fashion (and the means of advancement). Therefore when we find what look like Greek ways appearing in the native religions, it is likely that they result from such adoption.

built on the one or two sorts of evidence each happened to know, and neglected other material which would have shown that even the evidence considered had a significance somewhat different than that supposed. It may be worth while, therefore, to list and to comment briefly on the major bodies of evidence.

To begin, as every study of Judaism must begin, with the Bible. It must be remembered that the latest books of the Old Testament are products of the hellenistic age. Greeks had ruled Palestine for almost two centuries before Daniel was written, and Greek influence had been at work there for centuries prior to the advent of Greek rule.¹ It is therefore at least plausible to attribute such traits of the later Old Testament books as the shift of concern from the nation to the individual and the increase in importance of the concept of wisdom to that great shift in ways of life and thought which prepared for Alexander's conquest.

More certain evidence of hellenization are, of course, the Greek translations of the Bible. The preserved fragments of many different versions show that the translation of parts of the Old Testament into Greek was a process which kept recurring through a long period. However begun,² it was certainly carried on in Palestine, by and for Palestinians,³ and by and for both Jews and Samaritans.⁴ Palestinian rabbinic literature knows of Greek translations and sometimes approves and uses

¹ O. Sellers, *The Citadel of Beth Zur* (Philadelphia, 1933), summarizing the results of his excavation of this site, just south of Jerusalem, says, p. 10: "Foreign influence, even when the Persians were ruling, was largely Greek. Coins and pottery patterns came from the West, rather than from the East". Again, p. 41: "Culturally, from the early part of the fifth century Palestine was dominated by Greece. The few objects showing Persian influence are almost negligible." Substantially these same results are yielded by all the archaeological finds of this area and period.

² Clem. Alex., Strom. I. 150.1 f. (= 22, end), quotes from Aristobulus a statement that Greek translations of parts of the Old Testament had been made before Alexander's conquest of the Persians (omitting *kai*, with Stählin).

³ The translations of Aquila, Symmachus and possibly Theodotion were made either in Palestine or by Palestinians. Cf. S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (N.Y., 1942), pp. 2 and 17 ff.; H. Swete, *An Introduction to the OT in Greek* (Cambridge, 1914), pp. 31-53. That Theodotion, although originally from Asia Minor, worked in Palestine, is suggested by the tradition that makes him an Ebionite.

⁴ R. Devreese, *Int. à l'étude des MSS. grecs* (Paris, 1954), p. 130, n. 6.

them¹; fragments of them have been found in the manuscripts of the Qumran sect and the material found in Origen's time near Jericho (and plausibly attributed to the Qumran group) contained at least one or two Greek translations of parts of the Old Testament². Now the Qumran group seems to have been a sort of hyper-orthodox, self-enclosed ghetto. If, even in such a place, there were some people who could read the Bible better in Greek than in Hebrew, we are justified in arguing *a fortiori* about the linguistic condition of the rest of Palestine.

After the Bible and its Greek translations come the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, some of them originally written in Greek, all of the rest translated into it (some of the translations being made in Palestine).³ The hellenistic elements in their content have often been discussed.⁴ Next to these come the books of the New Testament and those of the Qumran sect and the rabbinic literature of the second and later centuries. The hellenization of the Christians will hardly be disputed. In particular the epistles of the New Testament certainly come from Greco-Roman models, in so far as they were not created *ad hoc* to meet the needs of particular situations. Further, the collecting of a particular man's letters is typical of the Greco-Roman world. But the members of the Qumran group also cast their thoughts into hellenistic forms, and so did the rabbinic teachers. The commentary, in particular, is probably a form of hellenistic origin since it is the natural expression of the sort of learning which was typical of the hellenistic world.⁵ Moreover, Lieberman has shown⁶ that the exegetic methods of the rabbis were

¹ Lieberman, *Greek*, loc. cit. in n. 2; E. Bickerman, *Some Notes on the Transmission of the LXX, Alexander Marx Jubilee Vol.* (English section, N.Y., 1950), pp. 164-5.

² *Revue Biblique* (1956), p. 54; Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 53-6. That yet other Greek texts of the Old Testament circulated in Palestine is proved by their appearance in other Judean manuscript finds, cf. D. Barthélémy, "Redécouverte", *Revue Biblique*, lx (1953), 18 ff.

³ For example, the Greek version of Esther, made in Jerusalem in the time of Alex. Jannaeus, E. Bickerman, "Notes on the Greek Book of Esther", *Proc. Amer. Acad. Jewish Res.*, xx. (1951), 108, 114.

⁴ See the refs. in R. Pfeiffer, *History of NT Times* (N.Y., 1949), under the individual books. ⁵ Schmid-Stählin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, 6th edn., II. i. 256.

⁶ *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (N.Y., 1950), pp. 20-82 and especially pp. 53-60 and 69.

remarkably similar to those of the Greeks and, in several important instances, their terminology was certainly borrowed from Greek sources.¹ Similarly, the new form of Jewish law code which appears in the second century A.D. is probably to be explained by connection with the codification of Roman law which was progressing at the same time. A code which grew solely from previous Jewish tradition would presumably have been much closer in form to earlier Jewish codes, notably Dt., which the sectarian documents did imitate.² Moreover, there are a number of parallels, both of substance and of form, between the Mishnah and the Roman codes.³

All the works hitherto mentioned—the later Biblical books, the Greek translations of the Bible, the apocryphal and pseud-epigraphic literature and its Greek translations, and the works of particular sects (including the rabbinic)—all these represent one strand of evidence, that which may be called the Biblical tradition, of which further examples are to be found in the Targumim, the earliest Jewish and Samaritan prayers, the Christian and Samaritan pseudepigrapha and such minor works as the Fasting Scroll and the Testament of Solomon, as well as some Jewish works preserved only in non-Jewish sources—the Jewish liturgical elements in the seventh and eighth books of the Apostolic Constitutions,⁴ some of the prayers in the magical

¹ Ibid. *gezerah shawah* is a translation of the Greek *sugkrisis pros ison*; the Hebrew term for numerical symbolism is *gematria* (= *geometria*) and that for interpretation of words as groups of initials is *notarikon*.

² Notably the Manual of Discipline and the Damaskusschrift. The imitation extends not only to wording and style, but also to structure; e.g. the combination of historical and juridical material in a single document: The Damaskusschrift begins like Deuteronomy with a history of the recent vicissitudes of the true Israel.

³ A formal parallel between Abot and Digesta I. 2 is alleged by B. Cohen, "Peculium in Jewish and Roman Law", *Proc. Amer. Acad. Jewish Res.*, xx. (1951), 135 ff. Cohen has demonstrated many particular parallels in points of content, and other evidences of Jewish knowledge of Roman law, see his articles in the *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Vol.*, the *Alex. Marx Jubilee Vol.*, the *Mélanges Isidore Lévy*, etc. More general parallels of form are also to be found. Of these, the preservation of minority opinions is of very great importance and is in striking contrast to the earlier Jewish and Near Eastern tradition.

⁴ W. Bousset, *Eine jüdische Gebetsammlung, Nachrichten*, K.G.W. (Göttingen, 1915), pp. 435 ff.; E. Goodenough, *By Light, Light* (New Haven, 1935), pp. 306 ff. (on which A. Nock's comments in *Gnomon*, xiii (1937), 163, n. 1, though

papyri,¹ and so on, all of them obviously shot through with hellenistic traits.

In contrast with these, the second great body of the evidence consists of the works written by Jews in the pagan literary tradition—mostly in the tradition of profane literature, though occasionally in the form and perhaps sometimes even in the spirit of pagan religious documents. The chief preserved examples of the profane sort are, of course, the works of Philo and Josephus, of which not the hellenization, but the essential Judaism, requires demonstration.² The chief examples of the religious sort are the Sibylline Oracles. Were these written to impress Jews or pagans? If pagans—they show a Jewish missionary propaganda prepared, like Paul, to adopt pagan forms of expression and make itself all things to all men. If Jews—they show that Jews were so likely to be reading pagan oracles and to be impressed by the authority of a pagan prophetess, that it was worth while for a Jewish preacher to disguise himself as a pagan prophetess in order to reach his fellow Jews.

A third great body of evidence is that composed of references to Jews and reminiscences of Jewish works in non-Jewish authors. Beside the great number of references (and the very few literary reminiscences) scattered through pagan literature, this class includes the vast bulk of Christian and early Moslem even Nock's knowledge is not so complete as to justify his statement that the expression "having attained remission of transgressions by means of the initiation" is "not possible in Hellenistic Judaism", see p. 486).

¹ On which E. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York, 1953 ff.) (Bollingen Series, 37), ii. 153 ff. and A. Nock's comments, *Gnomon*, xxvii (1955), 558 ff. An interesting point is raised by Nock's remarks (p. 570) on a charm which he thinks cannot be Jewish, because it is part of a technique to obtain Eros as a familiar spirit. He admits, however, that "it might be the work of a Jew who had wholly or partly abandoned tradition". Now it is not to be supposed that most Jewish magicians limited their supernatural associations to Yahweh, nor that, when they had resort to lesser powers, they thought themselves, or were thought, to abandon Judaism. If a Jew could be supposed to invoke Beelzebub, he could be supposed to invoke Eros. Just what is meant by abandoning tradition? Eros appears on the carved synagogues of Palestine and the Jewish catacombs of Rome; cf. Clementine Homilies, 5. 21.

² Such a demonstration has been given in Philo's case by H. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, 1947), 2 vols. For Josephus' loyalty to Judaism see my article, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century" in *Israel*, ed. M. Davis (New York, 1956), pp. 67 ff.

material, within which special attention is required by the series of works *adversus Iudaeos*, the works of the heresiologists, the references in Roman legal material, the liturgical reminiscences, and other equally diverse and specialized bodies of data.¹ Of all these, the works of the heresiologists and the early disputations against the Jews are the most informative (though perhaps the least reliable). They show a Judaism difficult to reconcile with the traditional picture of orthodoxy and strikingly marked by Greco-Roman influences.²

Finally there is the archaeological material, which falls into two great groups : one which is properly literary (and can be classed as archaeological only by the accident of its finding)—the papyri, the Dead Sea documents and the like ; another which is properly archaeological, in the sense that any writing on the objects is subordinate to the objects themselves, as explanations of their functions or the like. Here belong both individual objects—gems, coins, glassware, pottery, ossuaries, sarcophagi and so on—and the complexes of data yielded by excavations, which have brought to light a great number of structures—tombs, catacombs, synagogues, forts, palaces—and even whole settlements (Qumran) and towns (Gezer, Samaria, Sepphoris). The bulk of this properly archaeological material is composed of objects completely hellenistic in form.

Of these four bodies of evidence—the works of the Biblical tradition, the Jewish literature of pagan style, the testimonia concerning Jews, and the archaeological material—no one is complete by itself. Each must be constantly supplemented by reference to all the others. And each carries with it a reminder that the preserved material—even when accessible—represents

¹ The best single survey of this literature is still that in J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1914), i. 31-179. For the earlier classical literature see E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, 3/4 edn. (Leipzig, 1901), i. 41-74 and 106-11.

² The Jew Trypho in Justin's *Dialogue* begins a philosophical dispute in which he hears without protest that the Pharisees are a *hairesis* (like the Sadducees, Genistoi, Meristoi, Galileans, Hellenianio and Baptists) whose members no one speaking accurately would call Jews (80. 4), and that the Jews maintain God does not accept sacrifices made in Jerusalem, but only prayers offered in the diaspora (117. 2). Justin was a native Palestinian. The Judaism described by Epiphanius—another Palestinian—is even more surprising.

only a small part of what once existed. By their very existence, they demonstrate how much has been lost ; by the variety of the material they preserve, they prove the extent of our ignorance and tacitly warn of the danger of supposing that what is not to be found in them was never to be found at all.

This supposition would be dangerous in any field of ancient studies, but it is especially dangerous in the study of Judaism, because Jewish material has come down to us heavily censored. The censorship has been double—an external censorship by Christian authorities and a domestic censorship by Jews. (The domestic censorship we have seen above, at work in Exodus Rabba, in the material collected by Hoffmann as Midrash Tannaïm, and in the Targum on Psalms.) What material we have, is only such as got through this double sieve.¹ Yet even this preserved material, as we have seen, testifies *consistently* to the hellenization of ancient Judaism. What, then, would have been the testimony of the material which has disappeared ? We cannot be sure.

However, it is a suggestive fact that the objections in the third century to books of haggadah were much more violent than anything now preserved in such books would seem to excuse. Rabbi Joshua b. Levi said that those who wrote such books, or who read them, would have no share in the world to come.² R. Hiyya bar 'Abba said their hands should be cut off.³ R. Ze'ira calls their works 'books of magic'.⁴ What can have justified such expressions ? Perhaps the many parallels which still exist between haggadic statements and expressions in the magical papyri⁵ are, like the shards on a tell, mere scattered indications of what has been destroyed.

III. *The Archaeological Evidence and the Work of Goodenough*

With these possibilities in mind, let us turn to the work of E. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*.⁶

As to the usefulness of the work there is, of course, no

¹ What has disappeared in the relatively short period since the Middle Ages is suggested by S. Lieberman's book *Sheqi'in* (Jerusalem, 1939).

² J. Shabbat, 16. 1 (15c).

³ Ibid.

⁴ J. Ma'aser, 3. 10 (51a).

⁵ For examples see the last section of this essay.

⁶ New York, 1953 ff. (Bollingen Series, 37).

question. Goodenough has performed an invaluable service by bringing together a great mass of the archaeological evidence. From now on his first three volumes, in particular, are an indispensable introduction to the study of the physical remains of Greco-Roman Judaism (and no serious study of the religion can safely neglect its physical remains).

As to the significance of these remains, Goodenough finds that most of the religious Jews in the Greco-Roman world (which for him includes, as it did in fact, Palestine) were primarily concerned about salvation, by which they meant spiritual peace in this life and the assurance of happiness hereafter.¹ To describe this salvation they certainly used the language of the mystery religions and to achieve it, he thinks, they may have adopted some of the mystery rites, particularly those involving a cup of wine which brought some special blessing. They gave a mystic interpretation to the Sabbath and the festivals and called those who agreed with them 'initiates', as contrasted with those who did not. That some Jews went further than this, Goodenough says, is possible, but unsubstantiated. Moreover, even those who went this far did not necessarily abandon the Law. Most Jews, like Philo, must have continued to observe the commandments as they knew them from Scripture and from their local traditions. They did so because of their loyalty to the group, because they thought these commandments valuable as spiritual discipline, and because they attributed to them allegorical meanings. It was this allegorizing and mystical Judaism which they expressed in the symbols they put on religious objects. Outside Palestine such expression was generally free to use animal and human forms; inside Palestine it was limited to vegetable and geometrical symbols by the Pharisees, who were able to enforce this limitation from the rise of the Maccabees to the destruction of the Temple, and whose rabbinic successors continued to exert great influence until the fall of Bar Koseba. After 135, however, the successors of the

¹ Goodenough could have supported this opinion with a number of passages from rabbinic literature, for instance, *Abodah Zarah* 19b: "R. Alexandri (went about) crying, 'Who wants life? Who wants life?' All the world came flocking to him, saying to him, 'Give us life!' He said to them" (*Ps.* xxxiv. 13 ff.). R. Alexandri here begins like a typical Greek street-corner philosopher.

Pharisees were reduced to an isolated clique and the popular mystical religion had its hands free in the decoration of the synagogues of Galilee and the catacombs of Beth Shearim as well as of those in Rome and North Africa. Only with the Middle Ages did the followers of the rabbinic tradition, from their base in Babylonia, succeed in converting most Jews of the Mediterranean basin to the Judaism of the Talmud. Thus Goodenough.

It is inevitable that so comprehensive a theory should lay itself open to attack from many sides. That the Pharisees, even during the short periods when they were certainly in power, could have controlled the decorative art of the whole country seems impossible. That after the fall of Bethar the rabbis were reduced to an unimportant clique is contradicted by the implications of a vast number of stories in rabbinic literature and by the provisions of Roman law, which from the time of Constantine, at least, granted the Jewish Patriarch the same rank as the foremost Christian clerics and empowered him to send out representatives to "exact" tribute from the synagogues.¹ Along with the theory of the isolation of the rabbis goes a false notion of rabbinic Judaism as almost free of Hellenization. This often results in the supposition that Hellenistic material must be contrary, or at least alien, to rabbinic influence.

In considering the work as a whole, however, it seems less important to justify these criticisms in detail than to ask how far, if justified, they would affect the theory. For the theory is not a unit. The rôle assigned to the Pharisees, for instance, is unnecessary to the interpretation of the symbols. The Pharisees and their successors, though undoubtedly important, were only one branch of the religion; therefore Goodenough may be right in refusing to force the interpretation of the archaeological material to accord with rabbinic dicta. The final truth or falsity of the theory as a whole, therefore, can be determined only by careful reconsideration of all the evidence. It is a great merit of the work to have facilitated such reconsideration, not only by collection of the archaeological material, but also by emphasis on important facts which that material, when collected, and only when collected, reveals.

¹ Codex Theod. 16. 8. 13-17.

The first of these facts—which we should never have expected even from the Greco-Roman literary remains—is the wide extent of iconic decoration from the second century on. Of course, there were some references to iconic decoration in the literature: even Herod Agrippa I, the friend of the Pharisees, had in his palace at Caesarea statues of his daughters.¹ But hitherto such details could be treated as exceptional. Now that the material has been collected it appears that decoration with human figures was customary even in Jewish religious buildings. The second and third century catacombs of Rome show Victory crowning a youth, Fortuna pouring a libation, cupids, adolescent erotes, and so on.² A similar catacomb is reported near Carthage.³ The second or third century synagogue of Capernaum had over its main door an eagle, carved in high relief. Over the eagle was a frieze of six naked erotes, carrying garlands. Inside was not only a frieze containing human, animal and mythological figures, but also a pair of free-standing statues of lions, probably in front of the Torah shrine.⁴ The synagogue of Chorazin, of about the same date, had similar statues and a frieze showing vintage scenes of the sort traditionally associated with the cult of Dionysus.⁵ Remains of some dozen other synagogues scattered about Palestine show traces of similar carved decoration.⁶ There are human figures in high relief in the second-to-fourth century catacombs of Beth Shearim.⁷ From the same period the synagogue of Dura shows a full interior decoration of frescoes representing Biblical scenes.⁸ From the fourth and fifth century synagogues of Palestine we have half a dozen mosaic floors, and there is reason to believe that in about half of them the central panel was occupied by a picture which, if not found in a synagogue, would be recognized as a representation of the sun god driving his chariot.⁹

So long as these remains were studied one group at a time, they might be explained as heretical. This is now impossible. On the other hand, it is dangerous to explain them as orthodox, first, because the meaning of orthodoxy is uncertain for this

¹ *Antiquities*, 19. 357.

³ *Id.* 2. 63-8.

⁷ *Id.* 1. 89-102.

⁴ *Id.* 1. 181-92.

⁸ *Id.* 1. 227-32.

² Goodenough, ii. 4-44.

⁵ *Id.* 1. 193-9.

⁶ *Id.* 1. 199-225.

⁹ *Id.* 1. 239-62.

period, second, because the carved decoration of the Galilean synagogues shows deliberate mutilation: human and animal figures have been chipped away carefully, so as to leave the rest of the carving undamaged.¹ Similarly, the eyes of some figures in the Dura synagogue have been gouged out, but the rest of the faces left unmarked.² Again, a sarcophagus in Beth Shearim was broken up in ancient times, probably because it showed Leda and the swan and other carved figures.³ Unfortunately, the date of the mutilations in the carved synagogues is a matter of dispute. Those who maintain that carved decoration was always permitted by orthodox Judaism can blame the destruction on the Moslems. But if these synagogues housed orthodox Judaism, then it must have been somewhat different than it is pictured by the rabbinic literature.⁴ This is true even of Dura, where the decoration looks most nearly orthodox. At Dura, in the south doorpost hole, under the plaster, was a small, irregular cavity, containing the bones of one human middle finger and the end bone of another; in the sockets of the smaller door were found several human teeth.⁵ If the finger bones had sufficient flesh attached to them when they were placed there they would have rendered everyone in the building unclean.⁶ This, however, can scarcely have been the object of the person who put them there—if we can judge by rabbinic law, for it held such uncleanness to be general in gentile lands, where graves are not marked and there is no assurance that a man may not at any moment walk above one.⁷ Therefore this is probably no mere question

¹ Goodenough, I. 184-9; 193-6; 201-4; 206; 208.

² Goodenough, in a note to me, compares Rosh Hashshannah 24b, where to "put out the eye" of a figure on a ring means to disfigure it so that it will no longer occasion the suspicion that it is an object of reverence.

³ Id. I. 138.

⁴ For the upshot of the rabbinic evidence see B. Cohen, "Art in Jewish Law", *Judaism*, iii (1954), 165 ff.

⁵ Goodenough, i. 228.

⁶ 'Oholot, 2. 1.

⁷ 'Oholot, 18. 6. Further, even rabbinic tradition contains some elements which show an amazing indifference to this consideration, e.g. the story that Solomon brought the coffin of David into the Temple (*Pesiq. Rab.* 2, ed. Friedmann 6 b, & parallels). Instead of polluting it, this produced the descent of the heavenly fire. Can this story, or the practice of Dura, have been influenced by the Christian use of the remains of martyrs?

of uncleanness : Goodenough is probably right in saying that these bones were put in the building deliberately, by the builders, in some sort of " foundation ritual ".

This, therefore, is the first problem which Goodenough's work reveals : On the one hand, rabbinic literature shows us the rabbis exercising a wide influence, and its evidence is confirmed by that of Roman law. On the other hand, the preserved archaeological material shows us details which look very different from what the rabbinic literature would lead us to expect. How can these two bodies of evidence be reconciled ? Elements of the eventual reconciliation (if any) may be suggested by what has been said above : A great deal of rabbinic literature has not been preserved ; the great bulk of non-rabbinic Jewish literature has been lost ; most of the written material which *has* come down to us is preserved in late manuscripts which have passed through a double censorship. We have seen above several cases where such censorship deleted from rabbinic material references to the human form as an image of God. Compare the removal of human and animal forms from the synagogues.

Another point made clear only by Goodenough's work is the chronological sequence and change in the styles of decoration. Roughly speaking, the most important datable material falls into three great groups. First is the Palestinian material of the first centuries B.C. and A.D. ; next come the great catacombs both in Palestine and in the Diaspora, and the carved synagogues in Palestine, which are typical of the second and third centuries A.D. (contemporary with these is Dura, which is the first example of a transitional group of synagogues) ; finally come the synagogues with extensive mosaics, principally, but not exclusively, in Palestine and mostly in the fourth and fifth centuries.¹

The first group—the Palestinian material of the first centuries B.C. and A.D.—is characterized by the almost total absence of animal and human figures. It comes principally from the big tombs around Jerusalem, from ossuaries and lamps found mostly in tombs, and from the Maccabean coins. Since the

¹ While the magical gems with *Iao*, *Sabaoth* and the like cannot be dated certainly, most of them come from the third to the fifth century A.D. and from the eastern half of the Roman Empire, especially Syria and Egypt.

ossuaries and elaborate tombs could be afforded only by the rich and the coins show the choice of government officials, this material probably represents *principally* the taste of the Sadducees and the Herodians. This may partly account for the predominance—especially in the tombs—of vegetable decoration which is reminiscent of contemporary Roman style.¹ Similar Roman influence has been remarked in the Herodian coin types² and in the *opus reticulatum* of the Herodian palace at Jericho, for which Italian architects and builders were imported.³ Roman or otherwise, there is no question that vegetable and geometric decoration makes up almost all the Jewish art of this period, and that the most significant thing about this art would seem to be its *apparent* (which here does not mean *certain*) lack of significance.

Yet even some of the elements of this style of decoration seem to have had, sometimes at least, some symbolic significance, as signs of good luck or of a hope for better things either in this world or hereafter. Goodenough seems justified when he argues that some such significance must have been attached sometimes to the representation of a wine-jar or cup, sometimes with a vine growing out of it. As he points out, jar and vine together were found on an amulet placed between the thighs of a female figure in an undisturbed Jewish grave of the late Roman period in

¹ Goodenough, 3, nos. 22-32. The commonest element is an architrave decorated with triglyphs and with rosettes, wreaths, bull's-eyes, or other round objects in the metopes (nos. 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32). This appears also in Pompei: H. Beyen, *Die Pompejanische Wanddekoration* (Haag, 1938), I, Tafeln, nos. 82, 83; L. Curtius, *Die Wandmalerei Pompejis* (Leipzig, n.d. (1929)), figs. 60, 77, 79. In Goodenough, 3, 26 the metopes are left blank, as they are, e.g. in Curtius, fig. 43. The wreath and rosette of the lower element of Goodenough 3, 31 are strikingly similar to those of the *ara pacis*, Curtius, fig. 80, cf. L. Curtius, *Das Antike Rom* (Vienna, n.d. (1944)), no. 157. The same type of wreath appears in Pompei, Beyen 6a-c, 77, 87. The use of two vines growing from a group of three acanthus leaves, which appears in Goodenough 3, 22 and 23, also appears on the *ara pacis*, Curtius, *Antike Rom*, nos. 154, 155, 158. The pyramid of Goodenough 3, 27 recalls, of course, the pyramid of Cestius (a Neopythagorean?), Curtius, A.R., no. 177; the concave cone of 3, 28 appears in Pompei: Beyen, nos. 56-8 = Curtius, W.P., figs. 70, 74. Thus almost all the motifs found in these monuments appear in contemporary Roman art.

² J. Meyshan, "The Coinage of Agrippa the First", *Israel Explor. J.*, iv (1954), 186 ff.

³ J. Kelso and D. Baramki, *Excavations at NT Jericho* (New Haven, 1955) (Annual ASOR, 29-30), 5b and 10a-11a.

Gezer, and a design on an amulet so used is presumably significant.¹ There are also one or two ossuaries on which the sort of chalice from which the vine customarily grows has been added, more or less inexpertly, to the ready-made decoration.² Such deliberate addition does look meaningful. Another such symbol may have been the lily, since Goodenough has shown that lilies also were added inexpertly to ossuaries³ and we shall meet them presently in another connection. Apart from these, however, the most striking characteristic of the art of this period is its apparent insignificance.

This makes more important the fact established by Goodenough, that the next period—chiefly the second and third centuries A.D.—shows the sudden and widespread appearance of forms much more likely to be symbolic. These forms, as Goodenough remarks, are of two classes: first come those drawn from contemporary pagan art—eagles and other birds, erotes, victories, mythological figures like sirens and centaurs, lions and so on, which appear on both the Roman catacombs and sarcophagi and the carved synagogues of Galilee. These are the most puzzling part of the whole body of material. It is difficult to conceive of a form of ancient Judaism which would symbolize some point of its belief or practice by a carved representation of a band of erotes, but it is equally difficult to conceive of a Jewish congregation of which the leaders, choosing decorations for their synagogue, with all the range of conventional Greco-Roman decoration to choose from, should choose by mere aesthetic preference to put six naked, adolescent erotes over the main entrance. In more abstract terms; if the objects are insignificant it is very difficult to explain why they were chosen, but if they are not insignificant, what can they possibly signify?

Here the discussion is complicated by the fact that these objects are among those customarily represented by classical art, and their significance in classical art is also a matter of dispute.⁴

¹ J. Kelso and D. Baramki, *Excavations at NT Jericho* (New Haven, 1955) (Annual ASOR, 29-30), 5b and 10a-11a. l. 166.

² Id. 3. 155 and perhaps 157.

³ Id. 3. 192 and perhaps 175.

⁴ See especially F. Cumont, *Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains* (Paris, 1942) (H.-C. de l'Etat fr. en Syrie et au Liban, *Bibl. Arch. et Hist.*, p. 35) and A. Nock, "Sarcophagi and Symbolism", *AJA*, l (1946), 140 ff., summarized in

There is agreement that they were interpreted philosophically by the Pythagoreans and Stoics and by some small religious groups of lower social standing.¹ It is agreed, too, that on some monuments, at least, these common objects are used as symbols of the philosophical or religious interpretations attached to them.² On the other hand, it has been tacitly assumed that they are used on many other monuments as pure decoration or with exclusively secular meanings. This assumption is not beyond question. Every action in the ancient world had its appropriate deity—as the word *venery* still testifies³—and it is not to be taken for granted that the figures in the wall decorations of Pompei, for instance, merely because they were not worshipped, were therefore wholly without religious significance.⁴

However, if it be granted that such a thing as wholly secular art did exist in the ancient world, and if many of the apparently Dionysiac remains be described as secular, it will follow that secular and religious art often represented the same objects in the same way. Therefore the connotations—as opposed to the significance—of the one can scarcely have been absent from the other. As Cumont says with reference to Dionysiac scenes, “it would be absurd to suppose” that they could have been used without knowledge of their common mythological significance.⁵

his review of Cumont, *JRS*, xxxviii (1948), 154 ff. Further, G. Hanfmann, *The Season Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks* (Cambridge, 1951), 2 vols.; Nock, review of Goodenough, in *Gnomon* xxvii (1955), 558 ff., and the literature cited in these works.

¹ Nock, *AJA*, I. 169, finds evidence for lower class resort to allegorization in Hippolytus' report of the Naasenes, *Philosophumena*, 5. 1 ff.

² E.g. in the underground basilica in the Porta Maggiore, Nock, *AJA*, I. 168; cf. M.-J. Lagrange, review of J. Carcopino, *La basilique pythagoricienne* (Paris 1926), in *RB*, xxxvi (1927), 599 ff.

³ E.g. *kai ta Demetros kai ta Aphrodites* = “both eating and sexual gratification”, Diog. Laert. 6. 69; cf. the remarks of R. Marcus, *Jewish and Greek Elements in the LXX*, L. Ginzberg *Jubilee Volume* (English Section, New York, 1945), pp. 232-3.

⁴ Contrast Nock, *Gnomon*, 27. 566. In speaking of public buildings it must be remembered that the ancient state dealt with the gods as well as with men, and since the gods were concerned in all acts of life, all its functions were, to an extent, religious.

⁵ *Recherches*, p. 486, cf. Nock, *Gnomon*, 27. 564. The supposition is particularly unlikely for synagogues in the basin of the Sea of Galilee, since the largest town in the basin, Scythopolis, was the legendary site of the tomb of

Therefore any estimate of the significance of such motifs when they appear in Jewish material must explain them either by the supposition of a very tolerant, not to say syncretistic, Judaism, or by a significance sufficiently important to lead the users to overlook these inevitable pagan connotations.

For such an explanation it is not enough merely to find some excuse which might account for such objects not having been prohibited. They were not put in synagogues merely because they were not prohibited. Any number of other objects were not prohibited, but were not represented, either. It is necessary to account, first, for the representation of these particular objects, and second, for their representation in spite of the pagan connotations they must have carried. The supposition that some symbolic meaning was attached to them would satisfy these requirements and is not, *per se*, impossible, since symbolic meaning was admittedly attributed to them by some groups in the pagan world. That some Palestinian and Roman Jews followed the example of these groups in allegorizing statues and pictures, as some Alexandrian Jews did in allegorizing laws and legends, is not unlikely.

Its likelihood is increased by the fact that the other group of forms which appears in this same Jewish art of the second and third centuries is made up of Jewish objects which are almost

Dionysus' nurse, Nyssa (from whom it took its alternative name) and was a centre of his cult (G. Hill, "Some Palestinian Cults", *Proc. Brit. Acad.* (1911-12), pp. 411 ff.). Nock's statement that "only to Gentiles did the golden vine of the Temple suggest Dionysus" (my italics) is unsupported and can hardly be true, given the earlier history of the association of the cult of Yahweh with that of Dionysus-Sabazios (see the refs. collected by S. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine* (London, 1930) (Schweich Lectures, 1925), pp. 194 f.; H. Gressmann, *Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblischen Jdms.* (Giessen, 1925), pp. 16 ff., and M. Nilsson, *Gesch. der gr. Religion* (Munich, 1941-50), ii. 636 f.). The mask of Silenus which accompanies the enthroned god on the YHD or YHW coin of about 350 B.C. (Goodenough 3. 670) can hardly be explained as a reference to the theatre. The cult of Dionysus had evidently made its way into Palestine by that time, but it is almost incredible that the Greek theatre should have followed it so soon. Hanfmann's suggestion, *Sarcophagus* I. 195, that the vintage scenes on Jewish sarcophagi may be interpreted as seasonal rather than Dionysiac, neglects the fact that the vintagers are putti, and rests on what is probably a false antithesis, made possible by the separations of two connotations of vintage normally conjoined in ancient thought.

certainly symbolic¹—the menorah, the lulab, the ethrog, the shofar and the Torah shrine. It is one of Goodenough's major contributions to have pointed out² that these are all second century introductions, either extremely rare or entirely absent in the earlier periods. Some are of obvious significance. It can hardly be doubted, for instance, that the Torah shrine means the Law—however the Law may have been interpreted—and that when it is put in the centre or at the top of a decorated area it means that the Torah is the centre or the highest thing of life. But if this be granted it should follow that an equal significance is to be attached to the fact that in the diaspora the Torah shrine is comparatively rare. Outside Palestine the menorah is much more frequent and it is usually the menorah which is the centre of decorated areas. There is even one instance, in the catacomb of Torlonia, where the menorah is in the centre and the Torah is off to one side.³ Another interesting fact is that on amulets there are many menorahs⁴ but, so far as I remember, no Torah shrines.

IV. *The Menorah and the Tree*

What, then, did the menorah mean? Goodenough has pointed out an inscription under a menorah⁵ which has been restored as reading "Image of the God who sees". But the restoration is not perfectly certain.

Some evidence as to the meaning of the menorah and, especially, as to why it was appropriate for graves, is to be found in Sifre Debarim 10 :⁶ "R. Simon b. Johai says, 'The faces of the righteous in the world to come appear as seven joys : as the sun

¹ This argument is applied by Hanfmann, *Sarcophagus*, 194, to the interpretation of the sun and the seasons in the mosaics on the synagogue floors. He supposes that, because of their Roman sources, it is possible that these mosaics "may be no more than calendars", but goes on to observe that "since other mosaics in these synagogues show objects of cult, an allegorical interpretation seems more likely".

² 1. 86 ; 4. 67 f.

³ 3. 810. Cf. the gold disk, 3. 1034, where the lulab looks so much like a Torah scroll as to make its identity doubtful. (I cannot see the resemblance to 1033 referred to by Goodenough 2. 222.)

⁴ Goodenough, 3. 1009-34.

⁵ J.-B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum* (Vatican City, 1936-52), i. 696.

⁶ On Deut. i. 10, ed. Finkelstein, p. 18.

and as the moon, as the firmament, as the stars and as the ightnings and as lilies and as the menorah of the Temple. Whence do we learn, "as the sun and as the moon"? Because it is said, "Beautiful as the moon, clear as the sun".¹ Whence, "as the firmament"? Because it is said, "And those who are wise shall shine as the glory of the firmament".² Whence, "as the stars"? Because it is said, "And those who turn many to righteousness shall be as the stars".³ Whence, "as the lightnings"? Because it is said, "They shall dart as the lightnings".⁴ Whence, "as lilies"? Because it is said, "For him who triumphs together with lilies."⁵ Whence, as the menorah of the Temple"? Because it is said, "And there are two olive trees beside it, one on the right of the bowl and the other on its left".⁶

Now this is clearly an example of what was discussed above—of a preacher getting his ideas from the surrounding world and then hunting out verses from the Bible to justify them. R. Simon has from somewhere—certainly not from the Old Testament, but probably from the Greco-Roman world around him⁷—the notion that there are to be seven classes of saints in the world to come. This notion was widely accepted in Judaism⁸ and R. Simon wished to find verses of Scripture to justify it. For this purpose he was apparently able to draw on a number of earlier interpretations which treated single verses or groups of verses as descriptions of the righteous in the world to come. The first of these interpretations used a verse from the Song of Songs, which,

¹ Song of Sol. vi. 10.

² Dan. xii. 3.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Nahum. ii. 5.

⁵ Ps. xlv. 1.

⁶ Zech. iv. 3.

⁷ Cumont, *Recherches*, p. 383, n. 4, thinks this notion comes from that of ascent through the seven planetary spheres, originally 'chaldean', then hellenized and diffused throughout the Roman Empire.

⁸ E.g. in Sifre Deb. 10 it is evidenced by two distinct sayings. It is found, beside the passage cited above, in Sifre Deb. 47 on Deut. xi. 21 (ed. Finkelstein, p. 105); in Midrash Tannaïm on the same verses of Deut. (ed. Hoffmann, pp. 6 and 40); in J. Hagiga, 2. 1 (77a); Wayyiqra Rabba, 30. 2; Midrash Tehillim on Pss. 11 (sec. 6) and 16 (sec. 12) (ed. Buber, fols. 51a and 62b); Pesiqta de Rab Kahana 28 on Lev. xxiii. 40 (ed. Buber, fols. 179b f.); and Yalqut Shim'oni 2. 59 on Judges v. 31, and 2. 656 on Ps. xi. 7. In Judaism outside rabbinic literature the idea appears in 4 Ezra (= 2 Esdras) vii. 91 ff., where it has probably been superimposed on an earlier saying listing the seven joys of the saints—a saying which also has rabbinic parallels, some of them occurring in connection with the passages cited above (notably as interpretations of Ps. xvi. 1).

in typical Hellenistic fashion, it interpreted allegorically. There it found the beloved compared to the sun and the moon, and it applied these comparisons to the righteous in the world to come. Next there was a good, strong proof text. Daniel (a work of the Hellenistic period) actually does contain the idea that the good will hereafter shine as stars and share the glory of the heaven—another notion which pretty certainly did not come from ancient Israelite belief and which was very common in the Hellenistic world.¹ So R. Simon used Dan. xii. 3 for two more classes. Next there was a verse in Nahum which said war chariots glitter like lightnings when rushing through the streets of a city. Any indefinite reference to war could be understood as referring to the war of the Messiah. Therefore someone took the comparison to lightnings as a description of the righteous, and R. Simon included it in his list. Next there was a Psalm which could be understood to refer to the Messiah and which had at the head of it three obscure words which could be forced to mean, “to him who triumphs together with lilies”. So the lilies could be taken to be the companions of the Messiah. Nobody would ever have thought of this meaning unless the lily had already become a symbol for the saints in the future life or the immortal soul or the resurrection or something of the sort. But we have seen from Goodenough that people in the century before R. Simon were already adding lilies to the decorations of their ossuaries. Further, a passage in *Tohorot* ² suggests that lilies were customarily planted on graves, and the Gospels use them as an example of the saints in this present life.³ So it is not unreasonable to believe that the lily had already acquired some such meaning. Another reason for thinking it had, is that R. Simon felt compelled to work it into his list, where it is patently out of place in a series of luminaries.

¹ For the frequency of the belief in astral immortality, Nock, *AJA*, I. 162. Many rabbinic passages imply the notion; a particularly explicit development of it is in *Sifre Deb.* 47 on Deut. xi. 21 which, *inter alia*, attributes to R. Akiba the (gnostic?) belief that there are sixty heavens, explains the differences in glory of the saints by reference to the differences in glory of the stars (so 1 Cor. xv. 4), and compares (or identifies?) the saints' rule of the world with that of the constellations.

² 3. 7.

³ Luke. xii. 27 f. and parallel.

Finally we come to the menorah. Zechariah saw a menorah standing between two olive trees. He asked what this meant and the angel who was with him told him that the seven lamps of the menorah are the seven eyes of the Lord, and the two olive trees are the anointed who stand by the Lord.¹ That the seven lamps of the menorah are the seven eyes of the Lord—i.e. the seven planets (?)²—is echoed by the magical papyri, where the sun and moon are the eyes of Agathos Daimon = Abraarm (sic) = lao,³ and explains and confirms the reading on the inscription noticed by Goodenough, “Image of the God who sees”.⁴

Further, the notion that the menorah is a symbol of God appears in other material. Josephus in his tract against Apion⁵ tells a story circulated, but not invented, by the latter, to the effect that the Temple had been robbed by an Idumean who played on the Jews’ credulity. He persuaded them that an epiphany of Apollo was to take place there. So persuaded, they remained at a reverent distance, while he played the part of the present deity by wearing a wooden device on which he had fixed three rows of lights, so that they seemed, to those at a distance, like stars moving upon the earth. Presumably Josephus is right in describing the story as a malicious fiction. But presumably, also, the story reflects what it was thought the Jews would expect to see if an epiphany took place. Evidently some Jews shared this opinion, since one carved such a deity on the walls of a catacomb in Beth Shearim⁶—a figure, in high relief, of a man

¹ Zech. iv. 1-14.

² The identification of the seven lights with the seven planets is suggested by Zechariah’s statement that they “run back and forth over the whole earth” (iv. 10) and is made by ancient tradition (see below) and by many modern commentators (see T. Robinson and F. Horst, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* (Tübingen, 1954), p. 231). Professor A. Sachs, in conversation with me, has expressed doubt that the seven planets were known in Judea as an astronomical class at the time of Zechariah (520-518 B.C.). It may be that for Zechariah the seven eyes of Jahweh were seven angels conceived as analogous to the Persian administrative officials, “the eyes of the King” who travelled all over the empire and reported to the central government (CAH. 4.197-8). However, by the time of Philo and Josephus the astral interpretation was evidently standard, as their independent use of it argues. For the rabbinic use of it, L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1909-38), 7 vols., vi. 65 f., n. 339.

³ PGM, ii. 122.

⁴ Of course a reference also to Gen. xvi. 13 f.

⁵ 2. 112 ff.

⁶ Goodenough, 3. 56.

wearing a menorah on his head. The thought of the man who carved this image was probably expressed by a prayer found in two Coptic magical papyri: "Jao Sabaoth be on my head, Adonai Eloi in my heart, that they lend me brilliance" and the carving has iconographic analogues among the drawings in the magical papyri.¹ Accordingly it is not surprising to find in Philo that the menorah is the symbol of "heaven" and its lights, of the planets²; in Clement of Alexandria³ that the lights symbolize the seven planets and the menorah itself is "the sign of Christ". In the Tanhuma the menorah is equated with the Lord leading Israel as a pillar of fire.⁴ In Midrash Tadshe its light is said to symbolize that of the Shekinah.⁵ In Pesiqta Rabbati⁶ the menorah is taken as a symbol of Israel and the bowl "on its head"⁷ as God. This recalls the Apocalypse⁸ where the seven golden lamps are the seven churches, and Christ is in the midst

¹ A. Kropp, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte* (hereafter = AKZ) (Brussels, 1930-1), 3 vols, ii. 91 (no. 28), cf. ii. 139 (no. 40). Cf. the specification in Sifre Zutta 8. 2 that the lighting of the lamps of the menorah was to be *kemin 'atarah*, "like a wreath" or "crown"—this Horovitz, ad loc. could not explain. Goodenough, I. 92 follows Abi-Yonah in thinking the carving an example of a "series of human figures supporting the symbols of their religion". Even if Abi-Yonah's figures represent Christians rather than Christ, it would remain to be determined whether they were human in more than form. The carving at Bet Shearim is at least equally close to some drawings of deities in magical papyri, e.g. a figure which represents an epiphany of Bes-Helios-Iao-Sabaoth-Adonai, B.M. Pap. 122 published in PGM, ii. 48 ff. (no. 8, lines 65-110) and Pl. I, Fig. 6. (Note the similarity of the costumes. In the papyrus the headdress may, at the time of drawing, have been understood as a representation of lights, but was actually a simplification of the ancient "hemhem" crown, see C. Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets* (Ann Arbor, 1950) (University of Michigan Humanistic Series, 49), 250. Bonner's reproductions nos. 217-19 show it worn by Harpocrates whom we shall meet again, below, as an image of Iao.) See also the figure represented in *Papyri Osloenses I*, ed. S. Eitrem (Oslo, 1925), p. 20 (badly reproduced in PGM, ii. 177 (no. 39)). The growths from the head might be seven in number and might represent the menorah, the tree of life, or the feather crown of Bes (F. Lexa, *La Magie dans l'Égypte antique* (Paris, 1925), 3, Pl. 21, Fig. 28), but they look most like "the seedfield head of Agathos Daimon" which we shall discuss below. Agathos Daimon in the magical papyri is frequently identified or associated with Iao. The text here is a love charm of a type in which Iao is often the deity invoked (more often, I believe, than Bes). It contains nothing which could not have been written by a Jew.

² Moses 2. 102-3.

⁴ Tezawweh I.

⁶ 8, ed. Friedmann 29b.

³ Stromata 5.6.34.9-35.2.

⁵ L. Ginzberg, *Legends*, 3. 161 and note.

⁷ Zech. iv. 2. f.

⁸ i. 12 ff.

of them, but compare also Chrysostom's statement that "as the lamp has the light on its head, so also the cross had blazing on its head the sun of righteousness".¹

Evidently the menorah may be a symbol of God,² or of the macrocosm, or of the microcosm, the individual saint. This is what we should expect in a theology influenced both by the Platonic notion of the cosmos, especially the celestial spheres, as an image of God,³ and by the Biblical notion—extended under Greco-Roman influence—of man as God's likeness. Accordingly, it is well within the limits of the evidence to see in the belief that the just were to become like the menorah a particular example of the belief that they were to become like God. Beholding his glory, as one Jew said, they were to be "changed into that same image, from glory into glory".⁴

But here we have a difficulty. R. Simon says the just will be like the menorah, but he quotes as proof text the verse about the olive trees standing beside it. Why? Because in the vision of Zechariah the menorah is the Lord and the olive trees are the just. In that case, why did not R. Simon compare the just to the olive trees? This so much troubled some copyists that the versions of the saying in *Pesiqta de R. Kahana*⁵ and *wayyiqra Rabba*⁶ dropped the reference to the olive trees and substituted the verse about the menorah. But this is clearly wrong, because, had the reference to the menorah stood there to begin with, nobody would have substituted a reference to olive trees. Another copyist, in *Midrash Tehillim*,⁷ dropped both menorah and olive trees and went back to Nahum, where the chariots are

¹ In *coemeterii appellationem*, middle (ed. Montfaucon (Venice, 1734), 2. 400 E).

² Either alone or united with the true Israel or with the individual saint. With God "on the head" of the menorah, as part of it (*Pesiq. R.* 8, cited above), cf. Christ as head of the Church (*Eph.* i. 22; iv. 15; v. 23; *Col.* i. 18); with God as (or, on) the head of the individual saint, cf. *1 Cor.* ii. 3. Here we have the same metaphor used in the same way—now for the collective relationship, again for the individual one. A particularly lucid and well-documented discussion of the Pauline concept is that by P. Benoit, "Corps, Tête et Plerôme", *RB*, lxxiii (1956), 5, ff., though I cannot agree with B.'s sharp distinction between the notion of Christ as ruler and the notion of him as physically united with the beings ruled.

³ *Timaeus* 37b-c.

⁴ *2 Cor.* iii. 18.

⁵ 28, ed. Buber, 179b.

⁶ 30. 2.

⁷ 11. 6, ed. Buber, 51a.

compared to torches as well as to lightnings ; he used the torches for his final comparison. But this, too, is certainly wrong, because all the other versions of the saying are against it and because, had the original saying used both comparisons from Nahum, it would certainly have used them together and not have inserted the lilies of Ps. 45 between them.¹

(However, this substitution made by the editor of Midrash Tehillim is instructive. It shows he was surprised by the fact that the torches of Nahum were not used. We should be, too. Certainly torches would have served better in a list of luminous objects than would lilies, and there was an independent tradition which compared their brilliance to that of the sanctified.² Therefore the fact that the lilies were kept and the torches of Nahum sacrificed confirms our previous suspicion that the comparison of the righteous dead to lilies was already standard and obligatory for the compiler of the list.)

But this does not solve the problem stated above : Why does the list compare the just to the menorah, but quote as proof the reference to the olive trees standing beside it ? The answer is, I think, that our saying was originally part of an interpretation of Ps. xvi. 11,³ translated as follows : " There are seven joys before thy face, (but) the supremacy (goes to) the pleasures at thy right hand".⁴ Our saying interpreted the first half of the verse ; it identified the seven joys with seven classes of the righteous⁵ which it compared to (1) sun, (2) moon, (3) heaven, (4) stars,

¹ Similarly, the insertion of the lightnings of Nahum between the heaven and the stars of Daniel, in Pesiq. d.R.K. 28 and Midrash Tannaïm p. 6, is a sure sign of corruption.

² When the High Priest, entering the Holy of Holies, was possessed by the Holy Ghost, " his face shone like torches " and he became, if not a god, at least more than man (Way. R. 21, end ; cf. Philo, *Quis rerum*, 84 ; *Somn.* 2. 189). A similar change took place in Phineas' face when he was possessed by the Holy Ghost ; he was therefore described as an angel, Way .R. 1. 1. Both Seth and Moses are said to have been called ' God ' because their faces shone, M. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the OT* (London, 1920), p. 9. Cf. the transfiguration, Mark ix. 2 ff.

³ This appears from the versions in Pesiq. d.R.K., Way. R., and Midrash Tehillim, all cited above, p. 498, n. 8.

⁴ The interpreters read *soba'* as *sheba'*.

⁵ As remarked above, p. 498, n. 8, this interpretation has been imposed on the older interpretation in 4 Ezra vii. 91 ff. which originally listed seven joys.

(5) lightnings, (6) lilies and (7) olive trees. It was followed ¹ by a comment on the second half of the verse. This comment inquired which class of the righteous ranked highest. It recalled Zechariah's statement ² that the olive trees were on both the right hand and on the left hand of the menorah, which symbolized God, and it understood the second half of the verse ("but the supremacy goes to the pleasures at thy right hand") as declaring that those olive trees on the right of the menorah ranked highest.

Thus the menorah originally appeared as a symbol of God, in the explanation of the second half of the verse. Later it was transferred to the explanation of the first half, where it replaced the olive trees as the final term.³ Why? Partly because it was a source of light and most of the items in the list above were luminaries. Notice that in its original form the list fell clearly into two parts, a first section (classes 1-5) in which the saints are compared to luminaries, a second (classes 6 and 7) in which they are compared to vegetation. The equation of life with light was on the increase in the Roman world⁴ and the influence of this primarily pagan development upon Jewish thought is shown by the substitution of the menorah for the olive trees. The astral symbolism certainly dates back to Daniel,⁵ but the vegetable symbolism is probably older, for had it not been pre-established it would not have been included in this list, which could easily

¹ As it still is in Pesiq. d.R.K. and Way. R. and—after one brief section—in Midrash Tehillim. The section in Midrash Tehillim is another list of seven classes of the righteous. That it was originally independent is indicated by the fact that it was prefixed to our list in Sifre D. 10 (and Midrash Tannaïm, p. 6), postfixed in Midrash Tehillim.

² iv. 3.

³ However, the original reading was preserved in two versions of the saying (Sifre Deb. 47 and Midrash Tannaïm, p. 40), the proof text for it in two more versions (Sifre Deb. 10 and Midrash Tannaïm, p. 6), and evidence of the corruption in the manifestly late emendations of the other texts.

⁴ See the note on astral immortality, p. 499, n. 1. Examples of the equation appear in the Dead Sea documents ("Children of Light") and the Gospel of John (*passim*) as well as in Lucian's city of lights (i.e. souls, *Vera Hist.* 1.29) and in the growing pagan cult of the sun, of which the influence is reflected in Christianity (Dölger, *Sol Salutis, Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit, Lumen Christi*), in the magical amulets and papyri, and in the synagogue mosaics.

⁵ 12. 3. An ingenious argument for astrological influence on Daniel is advanced by S. Weinstock, "The Geographical Catalogue in Acts 2. 9-11", *JRS*, xxxviii (1948), 43 ff.

have contained two more classes of luminaries. Moreover, the vegetable symbols originally outranked the astral, as proved by the original form of the saying and the following comment, which gave highest rank not to the sun, but to the olive trees. This conclusion, by the way, goes to support Goodenough's contention that the representations of lilies and olive sprigs, especially on the ossuaries of the period prior to 70, may be symbolic.¹

Further, the menorah also replaced the olive trees as the supreme term of the series of comparisons because, as shown above, it was the image of God. Now while man was at all times the image of God, he had been so most truly before the fall, and the perfection of the divine image, which he lost then, was to be restored in the world to come.² The supreme destiny of the righteous, therefore, is to become perfectly the image of God, and the influence of this belief on the development of our text is shown by the substitution of the image of God—the menorah—for that of the saint—the olive tree.

This substitution is not found only in the passage discussed. On the contrary, there are many instances of interchange or confusion of the two symbols. To understand these better we must examine at more length the meaning of the tree.

The comparison of a man to a tree and of a just man to a fruitful tree is, of course, an Old Testament commonplace,³ and is continued by rabbinic literature as a description of living men.⁴ At the same time, the material quoted above has shown that the rabbis transferred the comparison to the righteous in the world to come, and analogies for this transfer can easily be found:

¹ The symbolism persisted, of course, after the destruction of the Temple. When Aher entered paradise "he cut down the plants", i.e. used the spiritual power acquired by his mystical experience to lead good Jews into heresy (T. Hag. 2. 3, ed. Zuckerman, p. 234). As to the date of origin, the comparison of lilies to saints in the future life was perhaps unknown to the LXX translator of Ps. xlv. I since he rendered it as *Eis to telos, hyper ton alloiothesomenon* (reading *sheshshonim* and understanding it as Paul did in 1 Cor. xv. 52: "We shall all be changed"). This looks like a stage prior to the appearance of the symbolism and may have had something to do with it.

² See p. 477 sq. Further, Ginzberg, *Legends*, v. 112-14 and the passages cited there.

³ Ps. i. 3; lii. 10 (olive); xcii. 13 (palm and cedar); cxxviii. 3 (vine and olive); etc.

⁴ E.g. Ta'anit 5b-6a.

The saved man is compared to a tree in the Odes of Solomon,¹ and the magician who has invoked Adonai Sabaoth identifies himself, among other things, with the sacred tree.²

Perhaps it was this transference which led to the identification of the tree as the tree of life. A trace of this identification may already appear in the LXX version of Ps. i. 3, which reads, not, "He shall be like *a* tree planted by rivers of water", but, "He shall be like *the* tree planted by *the* dividing courses of the waters". No doubt it saw in the rivers of water a reference to the rivers of Paradise. The Targum to the same verse puts the matter beyond doubt; it renders, "He shall be like the tree of life". Similarly, the Jerusalem Talmud comments on the verse, "As for the tree of life . . . all the waters of creation go forth in diverse courses from beneath it",³ and Midrash Tehillim also interprets the verse by reference to the tree of life.⁴ Explicit identification goes back at least to the Psalms of Solomon, which declare, "The paradise of the Lord are the trees of life, which are his saints".⁵ This statement explains why, in the mosaic of Beth Alpha, the heaven from which the hand of God emerges is planted with a row of trees.⁶ The same idea explains the statement in Enoch that the trees of paradise eat the fruit of the tree of wisdom⁷ It appears also in Christian and magical works,⁸ and may therefore be taken as common to the various sects of ancient Judaism. Now the tree of life is frequently identified by apocryphal, pseudepigraphic, Christian and gnostic works with the olive tree.⁹ This identification, so far as I know, does not appear in the preserved rabbinic material, but R. Simon b. Johai's identification of the final class of saints with olive trees,

¹ xxxviii. 16 f. etc. See especially xi. 19 ff. where becoming like the trees of paradise is becoming like God.

² PGM, 2. 73 (12. 227); this is an invocation of Adonai Sabaoth, to prepare an amulet on which are to be engraved the words *Iao Sabaoth Abrasax*, *ibid.* 76.

³ Ber. 1. 1(2c).

⁴ 1. 19.

⁵ 14. 3.

⁶ Goodenough, 3, no. 638.

⁷ Enoch 32. 3. Thus all the manuscripts. Therefore Beer is mistaken, in Kautzsch's ed., in supplying "the holy" as a separate subject; Charles and Kahana rightly translate the text as is.

⁸ Kropp, *AKZ*, ii. 116 (no. 34), "It is Jesus Christ who gives healing to N.N. that he renew his whole body after the fashion of the tree of life which is in the midst of paradise".

⁹ Ginzberg, *Legends*, v. 119, n. 113.

and the midrashic identification of the typical saint with the tree of life, make it probable that the identification of the tree of life with the olive tree was once accepted by rabbinic, as well as by other, Jews.¹

It is upon the tree of life that God rests when he comes to the Garden of Eden—on this rabbinic, pseudepigraphic, Christian and magical texts agree.² This legend, plus the fact that the tree of life is the symbol of the saint, enables us to understand the cryptic saying of Resh Laqish, "The patriarchs, they are the throne of God".³ We should not expect this doctrine to be developed in the preserved rabbinic material, since the teaching about the throne of God is specified as that to be kept most secret of all,⁴ and quite possibly was not committed to writing.⁵

¹ Its disappearance from the preserved texts can hardly be accidental, since the rabbis are free in identifying or comparing the tree of knowledge with the rest of the trees important in the economic life of Palestine (Ginzberg, *Legends*, v. 97, n. 70). I suspect the deletion reflects dislike of the magical and religious use of oil, which played so large a part in Christian ceremonies and was justified, *inter alia*, by the legend that the olive tree had been the original tree of life; see the passages cited by Ginzberg in my preceding note and the fact remarked by H. Willoughby ("The Distinctive Sources of Palestinian Pilgrimage Iconography", *JBL*, lxxiv (1955), 62) that the most frequent inscription on ampullae from the first Christian pilgrimage period (300-600) is, "Oil of the tree of life from the holy places of Christ".

² Seder Gan 'Eden, Text B (A. Jellinek, *Bet hammidrash*, 3. 138); Apoc. of Moses 22. 4; II Enoch 8. 3 (Charles) — 5. 3 (Kahana). Kahana quotes a parallel from the Greek version of the Apocalypse of Paul, not accessible to me (ed. Tischendorf, p. 64). Kropp, *AKZ*, ii. 149 f. (no. 43) parallel ii. 104 (no. 32). From the context of the former, Davithea, who is represented as lying on the tree, is evidently a form of Sabaoth and Jesus.

³ Bereshit Rabba, 17. 6 (475); 69. 3 (793); cf. 68. 12 (786 f.). For other Jewish sayings which express the notion of the saint or scholar as theophoric, see Tanh. Wayyaqhel 7 (Students of the Law are like the Ark of the Covenant, because like it they contain God), and Tanh. ed. Buber, Wayyishlah 84a: "R. Huna said, 'If a man be corrupted by a transgression, destructive angels at once attack him. . . . What should a man do? Let him busy himself with the Law and he will be safe. And if he does not know how to repeat (by heart), let him read; and if he does not know how to read, let him take hold of (a book of) the Law and he will live, for it is said, (The Law is) "a tree of life to those who lay hold of it." So that if he is not a student of the Law he should lay hold of the book or of the professional repeater (of the oral Law), for they teach the Law, and (by so doing) he merits life.'"

⁴ Hagigah 2. 1 and parallels.

⁵ Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* I. 1. 13-14 etc.

However, the saying has an almost exact parallel in the common Christian expression, *theophoroi pateres*, of which the active and passive senses are not to be separated. Because the saint is inspired, possessed by God, he also bears God within himself, as is declared by the Latin *Deiferi apostoli*¹ and by the figures we have seen above bearing the menorah—the image of God—on their heads.

But since the saint (the perfect man) is the image of God, and the cosmos (which is also perfect)² is the image of God, we found the menorah, being the image of God, was also the image both of the saint and of the cosmos. Therefore we should expect the tree, being the image of the saint, to be equated with the menorah, at least when the latter represents the saint, and possibly when it is used with its other meanings. Equation as representations of the saint³ is exactly what we found indicated above by the substitution of the menorah for the olive tree in the conclusion of Sifre Debarim 10.⁴ It appears also in the Targum to Hosea xiv. 7. The Hebrew describes the blessed state of Israel in the time to come with the words, “His beauty shall be like the olive tree”; the Targum reads, “Their splendour shall be like the holy menorah”. The two prophets in the Apocalypse⁵ “are the two olive trees” (of Zechariah iv. 3, which we have seen above) “and the two menorahs which stand before the Lord of the whole earth”. (Since there was only one menorah in the Temple, it is plausible to find the source of *the two* menorahs in contemporary

¹ Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et inf. graecitatis, ad voc. theophoros*.

² Plato, *Timaeus*, 36 ff.

³ The equation does not seem to have been carried through to the extent of making the olive tree also the image of God, *except* when He is united with the saint. So far as I can recall this identification is absent from *all* the literatures considered (including the magical papyri of Jewish character). This fact is particularly surprising in view of the widespread tradition of tree worship both in the Semitic background (the asherah) and in contemporary Greco-Roman paganism (e.g. Apuleius, Florida 1). While the absence may be due to accident or to deletion, it does suggest that the Jewish tradition had some consistency throughout its various branches and was not wholly indiscriminate in its appropriations from the Greco-Roman world.

⁴ Finkelstein, in his note on Sifre Deb. 10 (p. 18 of his edn.), recognized the equivalence of the olive tree and the menorah from their usage as equivalents in that passage and its parallels.

⁵ 11. 4.

synagogue usage, which, if reflected by the archaeological evidence, often had two menorahs, one on either side of the Torah shrine.)¹

This equation of the tree (image of the saint) with the menorah (image of God)² extends even to their graphic representation. When sufficiently conventionalized the two are indistinguishable and there are many drawings which may represent either one.³ Often when the menorah can be distinguished it is only by the presence of the ethrog and lulab at its base.⁴ But it is just this combination with ethrog and lulab which identifies with the menorah three undoubtable trees on amulets published by Goodenough.⁵ One of these menorah-trees⁶ has a snake coiled around it, further identifying it as the tree of paradise⁷ which, as we saw above, was itself identified with the saint as the throne of God. This identification is here confirmed, for each of these trees is represented as a throne for a deity who sits on it. The deity is identified by the inscription of each of the amulets as Iao or Iao Sabaoth—but iconographically he is, in each instance, Harpocrates, one of the forms of the sun god who was becoming the great deity of the later Roman Empire.⁸ These amulets are

¹ Goodenough, 3. 58-61, 440, 639, 646, 706, 707, 817, 964-6, 973, 974.

² This coalescence of the two symbols appears already in the Assyrian period, S. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine* (London, 1930) (Schweich Lectures, 1925), p. 63 f.

³ Goodenough 3. 99 (the drawing on the right), 262, 315, 332, 342, 502, 765, 770, etc.

⁴ Id. 3. 582, 719, 730, 805, etc.

⁵ Id. 3. 1149, 1150, 1153; cf. 1103 (a lotus pod) and 1102.

⁶ No. 1153.

⁷ This identification evidently persisted or recurred in Judaism. An eighteenth or early nineteenth century Polish menorah of which the lamps are carried by a tree of life, complete with snake, is published by Judah Goldin in *These Lights, You and Judaism*, iv (1956), no. 2. The modern object should serve as a warning against any hasty supposition that the ancient ones could not have been produced by 'orthodox' Jews.

⁸ This leads us, of course, directly to the representations of the sun in the later Palestinian synagogue floors—a subject of such complexity as to require another article. As a result of Goodenough's work it is now apparent that the synagogue floors, the magical gems and the papyri, the Palestinian Amoraic literature, the Christian pseudepigrapha and the Christian patristic literature of Egypt, Palestine and Syria all come from the same period and the same area of the same world, and from closely related groups of that world; they use the same language and they must be interpreted together.

certainly related in content to the magical spells representing Davitheia-Sabaoth-Jesus as "lying on the bed of the tree of life".¹ Kropp, in his commentary on these spells, *ad loc.*, identified this bed as the zodiac, and if that be taken as the sphere of the fixed stars, the outmost sphere of the cosmos, this identification is probably correct, since we have seen that the menorah was taken to represent the cosmos, especially the planetary spheres, and Iamblichus says that the lotus on which Harpocrates was customarily enthroned (and which is here identified with the menorah-tree of life) was understood to represent the celestial spheres.² In sum, the tree of life, *qua* image of the theophoric saint, the microcosm, has been made also the image of the macrocosm, the physical cosmos which likewise bears that God of whom the heavens are the throne.³

This development of the significance of the tree was undoubtedly helped by identification with the menorah, and this identification probably explains the otherwise unlikely representation of the menorah as a headdress. We saw above that this symbolized the theophoric nature of the saints, but how did so unnatural a symbol arise? The origin, I think, is to be found in the wreath. Wreaths were commonly worn in the classical world on joyous occasions and were given to the winners in the games as symbols of victory. Jews wore them in their festivals—joyous occasions of which the joy was interpreted as anticipation of their coming, eschatological victory.⁴ Both as victorious in the contest of life and as joyous, the blessed were represented as wreathed,

¹ Kropp, *AKZ*, ii. 104, cf. 107 (no. 32) and 149 f. (no. 43) and Goodenough's discussion of these (2. 166 ff.). I agree with Goodenough in thinking these charms basically Jewish.

² *De mysteriis*, 7. 2.

³ *Is.* 66.1. The cosmos is equated with the throne of God in *Debarim Rabba*, ed. Lieberman, pp. 95-6. The sun-god on the lotus appears already on Hebrew seals of the Persian or Hellenistic periods, S. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine*, p. 58 and n. 1.

⁴ *Jubilees* 16. 30 prescribes the wearing of wreaths for the feast of Tabernacles. The bearers of the ark in the representation of that feast in the frescoes at Dura, and the children accompanying them, are wreathed, C. Kraeling, *The Synagogue* (New Haven, 1956) (*The Excavations at Dura*, VIII. 1) pp. 114-17. Kraeling, *ibid.* gives reference for the eschatological interpretation of the feast. Classic, of course, is the interpretation of the Sabbath as the type of the world to come, *Tamid*, end, cf. *Hebrews* iv. 3-11.

and the wreath came to be one of the symbols of salvation. The Odes of Solomon entreat the hearer to "make a crown of the tree of life and put it on your head".¹ But the crown of salvation was unwithering,² it was a living crown,³ for the joy it symbolized, the divine life, did not merely rest upon the blessed but was rooted in them⁴ so that they were crowned with a living tree of life. The first of the Odes of Solomon shows this development clearly: "The Lord is upon my head like a crown"⁵; and I shall not be without him. The crown of truth was woven for me; and it causeth thy branches to bud in me. For it is not like a withered crown that buddeth not, but thou livest upon my head and thou hast blossomed upon my head. Thy fruits are full-grown and perfect; they are full of thy salvation."⁶ Compare the curious growth on the head of the figure in Papyri Osloenses I,⁷ and the charm in which the Old Testament god who controls Helios is conjured by "him who sits in a fiery robe on the seed-field head of Agathos Daimon, the pantokrator and four-faced highest daimon".⁸ Since Agathos Daimon in this material is regularly the cosmos⁹ we have here the supreme fiery¹⁰ deity seated on the circle of the world.¹¹ The growth on the head has been reduced almost to insignificance and we are well along the

¹ 20. 7 f.; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 5; iv. 8; James i. 12; Apoc. ii. 10, etc. The notion is also common in rabbinic literature, v. Ginzberg, *Legends*, 1. 19, 57; 2. 196; 3. 92, 205, etc. Note that the Greek word generally translated "crown" means properly "wreath".

² 1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Pet. v. 4; Ephraim, Hymn for the Epiphany, quoted by R. Harris and A. Mingana in their edn. of *The Odes of Solomon* (Manchester, 1920), ii. 213 f.

³ *Odes of Solomon*, 17. 1.

⁴ Cf. Philo, *Ebrietas*, pp. 222-4, the vices and virtues are trees rooted in the soul of man.

⁵ Cf. Clement of Alex., *Paed.*, ii. 8. 63. 4: The Kings of the Jews used an elaborate crown composed of gold and precious stones, but the Christians symbolically wear Christ upon their heads.

⁶ Tr. Harris and Mingana, 2. 207.

⁷ Ed. S. Eitrem (Oslo, 1925), p. 20, discussed above, p. 501, n. 1

⁸ *PGM*, ii. 132 (14a).

⁹ *PGM*, ii. 146, cf. 122, 74, etc.

¹⁰ So Sifre Deb. 49. The notion goes back to Deut. iv. 24, quoted in Heb. xii. 29.

¹¹ Isaiah xl. 22. In this charm the cosmos is described by equation of Agathos Daimon, *pantokrator* (a common title of the sun god), the divine throne as seen by Ezekiel, and *hypsistos*. On the Jewish associations of *hypsistos* and *pantokrator*, see M. Nilsson, *Gesch. d. gr. Religion* (Munich, 1941-50), ii. 636 ff.

road which was travelled, not only by Judaism and its various offshoots, but by the Greco-Roman world in general, from the divine man to the wholly transcendental deity : from the good shepherd of the early Christian catacombs to the Christ Pantocrator of the Byzantine mosaic ceilings, from the cult of heroes and rulers to Julian's satire on the Emperors and the worship of the invincible sun, from the man crowned with the menorah in Beth Shearim to the fiery and unapproachable God of the Hekalot.

The metaphor of travel, here, is carefully chosen. Just as both ends of a road exist throughout the whole time of the journey, so in a large and complex society all sorts of attitudes towards all sorts of gods are always represented by some individuals ; it is only the centre of attention, the greater interest of the greater number, which shifts from one concept to another. The point to be noticed here is that this shift in ancient Judaism seems to have been of a piece with the general religious development of the ancient world.

To return to the menorah and the tree, and summarize the specific development which this last body of evidence suggests : The wreath of divine life which rewarded the saint took root in him and became a tree of life springing from him. But the tree of life was identified with the menorah and in Jewish circles the menorah came to replace it (as we have seen above in the case of *Sifre Debarim* 10) partly because of the increasing popularity of light-symbolism, but also in part because heterodox circles like those which produced the Odes of Solomon and the magical amulets seem to have been very fond of the tree of life and actually to have replaced the menorah by it. The replacement of it by the menorah may be a sign of orthodox reaction. At all events, the menorah did replace the tree of life, in some instances, as a most unlikely headdress, but an acceptable symbol of that divinity which may rest on man and which is already imaged in his nature. The notion thus expressed of the relationship between man and God is of immense antiquity and common to many cultures, but its revival in ancient Judaism was probably due, in large part, to the influence of the contemporary Greco-Roman world.

KING ARTHUR'S SWORD
OR
THE MAKING OF A MEDIEVAL ROMANCE ¹

By EUGÈNE VINAVER, M.A., D.Litt., D. ès L.

PROFESSOR OF FRENCH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

ANY thoughtful reader of medieval romance finds himself sooner or later faced with a dilemma not unlike that which confronts the traveller in a fairy tale who comes to a cross-roads : whichever way he may turn, not only dangers, but rewards lie ahead. He can enter the enchanted realm of popular fancy ; and as he travels along, at each step new vistas of magic lands will be revealed to him, new wonders and new mysteries. Or he may take the other way and find himself following the traces not of giants and magicians, but of the wielders of fine verse and prose, the masters of narrative art at its most delicate and most graceful ; he will then follow the road that leads to the discovery of a new marvel : that of the shaping spirit of man. Whatever he stands to gain in one direction he is apt to lose in the other ; such has been the fate of many, whether they knew it or not.

If for my present purpose I feel tempted to choose the less adventurous of these approaches, it is not through lack of natural curiosity about the intricacies of folklore, but because I am inclined to think that the authors with whose works I propose to deal would have considered this by far the wisest choice. They, who had all the wonders of the Isle of Britain at their command and all the mysteries of Brocéliande to call them out, applied their minds to the art of composing long and spacious poems and prose romances which bear only a superficial resemblance to popular tales. They drew, of course, freely and often indiscriminately upon the vast store of early tradition, written and oral ; but, faithful to the precepts of their native rhetoric, they were more interested in the way they handled their stories than in the

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 10th of October, 1957.

material they used. It would perhaps be an exaggeration to say with W. P. Ker that "there is a disappointment prepared for anyone who looks in the greater authors of the twelfth century for the music of the *Faerie Queene* or *La Belle Dame Sans Mercy*"¹; the music and the magic are there, but they are incidental to the central design and interest of the work; they are not the qualities that make it what it is. Those who think otherwise are as a rule victims of a fallacy common in many fields of literary study: they confuse the origin of a thing with its import and forget that "significance" is often an adventitious value.² Whatever is artistically and historically significant in the medieval romantic tradition is contained in the romances, not in their antecedents. In surveying the development of the genre one is reminded of Paul Valéry's remarks on "the two stages of invention":

Il faut être *deux* pour inventer. L'un forme des combinaisons, l'autre choisit, reconnaît ce qu'il désire et ce qui lui importe dans l'ensemble des produits du premier. Ce qu'on appelle "génie" est bien moins l'acte de celui-là, l'acte qui combine, que la promptitude du second à comprendre la valeur de ce qui vient de se produire et à saisir ce produit.³

Valéry is speaking here of what takes place within a single mind; but the same process can operate between two or several minds separated in time and space. Their number may vary as much as the distances between them: the definition of "genius" remains valid, no matter how long and laborious the preparation. And once the principle is grasped, the traditional trend of medieval literary studies can be reversed, the flight into the realm of legend arrested: literary history, instead of retrogressing as it generally does towards the dark uncertainties of Valéry's "first man", can then begin to follow the light which illumines the path of the second—the path of genius.

It will take more than the story of Arthur's sword to demonstrate the truth of these propositions, but the story is none the less worth telling, if only because it is so different from what one would expect. Most legendary swords provide a splendid opening for "background" studies. Behind the magic and the

¹ *Epic and Romance* (London, 1922), p. 326.

² According to Susanne Langer (*Philosophy in a New Key* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1942), p. 248), it always is adventitious.

³ *Tel Quel*, ii. 234.

luxury of the armour described in the Germanic and the Celtic epics lie fascinating vistas of cultural history: there is the Irish sword, Caladbolg, which in the hands of a great warrior could become the size of a rainbow and cut off the top of a hill;¹ and there is Beowulf's gigantic two-edged sword with a sumptuous gilded or gold-overlaid hilt upon which could be seen "interlaced serpents studded with gems".² Stark realism and unbridled poetic fantasy have an equal share in the description of these half-historical, half-legendary objects. And it is truly surprising how little realism or fantasy there is in what medieval writers have to say about Arthur's sword, Excalibur, how little room for speculation about its historical or legendary background. It is mentioned in the earliest known chronicle of Arthur's legendary reign, Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, but all that Geoffrey says about Arthur's sword is that its name was Caliburnus and that it was made in the isle of Avalon.³ Ever since Heinrich Zimmer in his review of Nutt's *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail* identified Caliburnus with the Irish Caladbolg⁴ critics have taken the identification for granted,⁵ but it is not clear what, apart from the first syllable of the name, the two swords have in common.⁶ Of the three arguments used by Zimmer two are based on errors of fact and one on false reasoning. He says that the two swords have "the same name" ("ein solch berühmtes Schwert mit gleichem Namen", etc.), which is clearly not the case; that both come from Fairyland, which is equally incorrect since there is no reason to suppose that at the

¹ In the Irish prose epic *Táin bó Cúalnge* (*The Cattle-Raid of Cooley*) it belongs to Fergus, the fugitive ruler of Ulster.

² Cf. A. T. Hatto, "Snake-swords and Boar-helms in Beowulf", *English Studies* (1957), p. 3.

³ "Accinctus etiam Caliburno, gladio optimo et in insula Avallonis fabricato", etc. (Edmond Faral, *La Légende arthurienne* (Paris, 1929), iii. 233).

⁴ *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* (10 June, 1890), pp. 516-17.

⁵ Cf. J. D. Bruce, *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the beginning down to the year 1300*, 2nd edn. (Göttingen and Baltimore, 1926), i. 87.

⁶ Caledwylch, the name of Arthur's sword in *Kulhwch and Olwen* and in the Welsh version of Geoffrey's *Historia*, is certainly related to Caladbolg and could be regarded as a link between Caladbolg and Caliburnus if it were established not only that Geoffrey knew the story of *Kulhwch and Olwen*, but that the name Caledwylch occurred in the version of the story which was available to him—a proposition clearly not capable of proof.

time when he wrote his *Historia* Geoffrey thought of the isle of Avalon as an enchanted island;¹ and finally that both swords are used in battle "in decisive moments" ("im entscheidenen Moment des Kampfes")—a remark which, one would imagine, would be true of almost any sword. What Zimmer does not say is that Caliburnus has none of the supernatural features of Caladbolg: it was, Geoffrey tells us, an excellent sword ("optimus gladius"), but there is no suggestion that it could reach the size of a rainbow or that it was ever used to cut off the tops of hills. A more likely model is the Latin word "chalybs", the poetical term for steel or sword,² which Virgil uses in the famous passage in the *Aeneid* describing "the melting in a vast furnace of the wound-inflicting steel" ("vulnificus chalybs"):

Fluit aes rivis aurique metallum,

Vulnificusque chalybs vasta fornace liquescit.³

If, as seems likely, Geoffrey knew this passage, he must also have known that Aeneas's sword was forged by Vulcan in the Lipari islands,⁴ and there is no reason to suppose that he had any other story in mind when he said that Arthur's sword was made on an island. Why he calls the island "insula Avallonis" is less clear. The name occurs again at the end of his chronicle of Arthur's reign where he states that Arthur, mortally wounded in battle, was taken to the Isle of Avalon for the healing of his wounds.⁵ In his *Vita Merlini* he describes the island as "insula pomorum",⁶ thus supplying a plausible etymology of Avalon,⁷

¹ It is only in the *Vita Merlini* written some twelve years later that Geoffrey makes the island to which Arthur was taken for the healing of his wounds into a land of plenty where crops and trees spring up of their own accord ("Omnis abest cultus, nisi quem natura ministrat"). On the literary sources of this description see Edmond Faral, "L'Île d'Avallon et la fée Morgane" in *Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature offerts à M. Alfred Jeanroy* (Paris, 1928), pp. 243-53.

² Cf. Edmond Faral, *La Légende arthurienne*, ii, 266. For other examples see Ovid, *Fast.* iv. 405; Propertius, i. 16, 30; Seneca, *Herc. Oet.*, 152, *Thyest.*, 364.

³ viii. 445-6.

⁴ viii. 416 ff.

⁵ "... ad sananda vulnera sua in insulam Avallonis evectus" (ch. 178).

⁶ "Insula pomorum, que fortunata vocatur,

Ex re nomen habet, quia per se singula profert"

(ed. Parry, lines 908-9).

⁷ Louis Cons and C. H. Slover (*Modern Philology*, xxviii. 385-94 and 395-9) have established the equation "avallo" = "poma" = "apples", taking the nom. pl. "poma" in the specialized post-classical sense. One important piece of

and there is room for conjecture as to a possible alternative derivation of the name. But even if we adopted the most fanciful of all theories, that of Sir John Rhÿs, who constructed out of his head a "Celtic dark divinity" called Avallach,¹ Caliburnus would still remain what it is in Geoffrey: a good sword with an intelligible Latin name, carrying memories of Virgil, but possessing no magic virtues to distinguish it from any other good sword. Its known history is confined to literary texts, and what these texts have to tell us is of far greater moment than the uncertainties that lie beyond.

The very first mention of Arthur's sword in twelfth-century romance reflects one of the major developments in contemporary imaginative literature. The sword, now called Escalibor²—hence the English form Excalibur—is Arthur's no more. It belongs to his nephew, Gawain, one of the two leading characters in the last and longest romance of Chrétien de Troyes, *Li Conte del Graal*. When Gawain faces imminent danger he is re-assured by the thought that he has Escalibor with him, "the best sword that ever was":

La meilleur espee qui fust,
Qu'elle trenche fer come fust.³

One of the sequels to the *Conte del Graal*, known as the "First Continuation", also says that Escalibor belongs to Gawain and adds by way of explanation that Arthur gave it to him:

evidence is the "Vienna Glossary" (first published by Endlichen in 1836 from a ninth-century manuscript) which gives "poma" as the equivalent of Gaulish "avallo" (Welsh "afal", Breton and Cornish "aval").

¹ See his *Studies in the Arthurian Legend* (Oxford, 1931), pp. 335-7 and E. K. Chambers, *Arthur of Britain* (London, 1927), p. 220.

² The addition of the "inorganic" prefix "es" is paralleled in Old French in such words as "escarboncle" (Lat. carbunculus), "eschafaut" (V. Lat.* catafalicum), "eschalaz" (V. Lat.* caracium) etc. The form "Escalibor" is found in some of the continental manuscripts of Wace's *Brut* (J, H and R), but the majority of manuscripts have the Galfridian form "C(h)aliburn(e)". Cf. *Le Roman de Brut*, ed. Ivor Arnold, p. 807.

³ *Le Roman de Perceval ou le conte du Graal*, ed. William Roach, lines 5899-5904. The phrase "trenche fer come fust" is probably responsible for the curious etymology suggested by the author of the *Estoire de Merlin* about half a century later: "c'est un non ebrieu qui dist en franchois trenche fer et achier et fust" (*The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, ed. H. O. Sommer, ii, 94).

Escalibor, sa bone espee,
Li a li rois Artus donee.¹

That Arthur should thus abandon his sword, the emblem of his power, may surprise any reader of Geoffrey of Monmouth or, for that matter, of Malory, especially as neither Chrétien de Troyes nor his continuator takes the trouble to explain how this came about. But the substitution of Gawain for Arthur is in fact a natural consequence of the great change that occurred in French Arthurian literature when the chronicles were succeeded by the romances and the great hero of the chronicles took second place to his knights. The Arthurian romances of Chrétien de Troyes are concerned not with Arthur, but with the brilliant fellowship of the Round Table. All that is left for Arthur to do is to preside over the court, encourage his knights to undertake deeds of valour and on occasions refuse to sit down to a meal until an adventure has been announced. No wonder, then, that the best sword that was ever made should be taken away from the benevolent but idle monarch and put into Gawain's hands. When in the third decade of the thirteenth century the age of prose romances began, most writers accepted the notion that Escalibor was Gawain's sword. It is thanks to Escalibor that in the prose *Lancelot* Gawain succeeds in standing up to twenty knights of the King of North Wales²; and when Lancelot has to prove Guinevere's innocence by fighting three redoubtable knights of Carmelide, Gawain comes forward and begs him to use his sword Escalibor :

So Sir Gawain girt his good sword Escalibor about Lancelot and prayed him to carry it for his love. And Lancelot said he would do so willingly.³

The gesture symbolizes the depth of Gawain's affection for Lancelot : once armed with Escalibor, Lancelot knows that

¹ Lines 12093-4 in MSS. *T*, *V* and *D*, 16203-4 in MS. *E*. See *The Continuations of the Old French Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. William Roach and Robert H. Ivy. In his verse rendering of Geoffrey's chronicle Wace suggests no such development. He mentions Arthur's sword five times (lines 9279, 10083, 11547, 12910 and 12926), but only once without Geoffrey's support (11547), and always in the same terms as Geoffrey.

² *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, ed. H. O. Sommer, iii. 386.

³ *Ibid.* iv. 61 : " Si li chainst mesire Gauvain Escaliborc sa boine espee et li proie que pour l'amour de lui la porte. Et dist qu'il le fera moult volentiers."

Gawain's love will save him from death and dishonour. But there is more to come. When in the final section of the prose *Lancelot*, the *Mort Artu*, Lancelot rescues Guinevere for the second time from the stake, he unwittingly slays the unarmed Gaheriet, Gawain's brother, and Gawain's love is turned to hate. In the ensuing struggle between Gawain and Lancelot, Escalibor appears once more in Gawain's hand, this time as an ironical reminder of the broken bond between the two best knights and truest friends. It is with Escalibor that Gawain strikes Lancelot in a fierce combat in which he himself is grievously wounded.¹ And although Lancelot refuses to take his friend's life, Gawain dies of his wounds. On his death-bed he bids Arthur send for Lancelot to save the kingdom from Mordred who has usurped the throne of Britain, but it is all too late; the "wicked Day of Destiny", as Malory will call it, is at hand: the day of the battle of Salisbury Plain, of Arthur's final encounter with Mordred and of the departure to Avalon. When all Arthur's fellowship has been destroyed and only one of his knights left to see him die, the King commands this knight to cast Escalibor into a near-by lake. A hand rises from the water, grasps the sword, and having brandished it three times vanishes into the depths of the lake.² From being a token of triumphant loyalty Escalibor becomes the instrument and the emblem of strife and disaster. It once failed to save Gawain; now it fails to save the noblest of all kings and the greatest of kingdoms.

This first flowering of the theme is an example of how certain thirteenth-century prose writers could make new values emerge from seemingly amorphous matter. Another variety of the narrative art of the period can be illustrated from the treatment of the same theme in one of the most widely read romances, the prose rendering of the story of Merlin originally written in octosyllabic verse by Robert de Borron.³ What distinguishes Robert de Borron from other Arthurian writers of his time is that he is primarily interested not in the romantic, but in the historical

¹ *La Mort le Roi Artu, roman du XIII^e siècle*, ed. Jean Frappier (Paris, 1936), pp. 170-1.

² *Ibid.*, p. 224.

³ Of this poem only the first 504 lines are extant. They were published by Francisque Michel (1841) as part of the *Roman du Saint-Graal* (lines 3515-4018).

and dynastic aspects of the Arthurian tradition, and looks for inspiration first and foremost in the Arthurian chronicles : in Geoffrey's *Historia* and in its adaptation by Wace. But like so many writers of his time he treats his sources not as models, but as material to be amplified : elaboration and complexity are to him greater virtues than simplicity. In the chronicles Arthur's accession to the throne presented no difficulty : he was considered the legitimate son of Uther Pendragon, and only Merlin and Uther knew that he was conceived before Uther married Igera. Now in Robert de Borron's account the marriage takes place two months instead of a few days after the conception, with the result that as soon as Arthur is born Merlin has to remove him from the palace. No one else knows the child's rank, and when Uther dies Merlin has to use all his ingenuity to establish Arthur's claim to the throne. Hence the story of the sword in the anvil, of how the young Arthur alone succeeded in pulling it from the stone and how on the strength of this he was proclaimed king. When some twenty-five or thirty years later another prose writer took up Robert de Borron's story and expanded it into a long chronicle of Arthur's reign entitled *L'Estoire de Merlin*, he naturally gave due prominence to the sword which Arthur drew from the anvil. The name of this sword was, of course, Escalibor ; it shone as brightly as if it were illumined by candles, and it was to ensure Arthur's triumph in his numerous encounters with his enemies. A curious complication arose, however, from the fact that the author, in spite of his strictly "Arthurian" orientation, felt that Escalibor should not be left in Arthur's hands for long. At the time when he wrote his pseudo-chronicle most of the Arthurian romances in verse and in prose had already appeared, and everyone knew that in these romances Escalibor belonged not to Arthur but to Gawain. The author had ultimately to comply with this tradition ; but it was not enough to say that Arthur gave the sword to Gawain : to justify the gift a new episode, that of Gawain's investiture by Arthur, had to be added. Gawain is made constable of Arthur's kingdom, and the next day, in the palace at Logres, Arthur knights him with the sword which he once drew from the stone :

So King Arthur took the sword which by Merlin's design he had drawn from

the stone, and he girt it about Gawain, his nephew. And then he attached the right spur and King Ban the left.¹

On no fewer than eight occasions² Escalibor will stand Gawain in good stead ; and it will never leave his side until the end of the *Estoire de Merlin*.

The implications of this new development are worth considering. The writers who originally placed Escalibor in Gawain's hands and those who imagined the part it was to play both in Gawain's life and in the scene of Arthur's death had used it as a symbolical expression of the rise of romantic chivalry, of the ties of loyalty between Gawain and Lancelot, and of the irony of the final disaster which befalls Arthur's kingdom. The author of the *Estoire de Merlin* set himself a no less ambitious task. Like Robert de Borron, he was primarily a *builder* of stories, anxious to expand the existing material in a coherent manner and to remove any inconsistencies and obscurities that might spoil his design. Faced with two seemingly conflicting traditions—the romantic tradition of Gawain and the chronicle tradition of Arthur—he endeavoured to reconcile them in a manner characteristic of his time. He knew that the sword with which a feudal lord armed his vassal was given, like all feudal privileges, in return for the vassal's reverence and faith ; that it was the vassal's duty, among other things, to go to the lord's rescue in battle if he saw him disarmed and unhorsed, and protect him by force of arms ;³ and that the sword was not only a token of this obligation, but the means by which it was to be discharged. Hence Gawain's investiture, thanks to which Escalibor remains to the end the emblem and the instrument of Arthur's power and of the destiny of his kingdom. But it was not sufficient to *rationalize* the situation in terms of a feudal convention : it was necessary also

¹ Sommer, op. cit. ii. 253 : " Si prinst li rois Artus sa boine espee qu'il osta del perron par le conseil Merlin, si la pent a Gavaine son neveu al costé, et puis li caucha l'esperon destre et li rois Bans le senestre."

² Ibid. pp. 306, 328-9, 340-1, 354, 356, 358, 362 and 369.

³ Cf. *Assises de Messire Jean d'Ibelin*, ed. Beugnot, vol. 1 (*Assises de la Haute Cour*), ch. cxcvi, pp. 315-16 : " Et chascun qui fait homage a autre est tenus par sa fei, ce il treuve son seignor en besoin d'armes, a pié, entre ses ennemis . . . de faire son leau poeir de remonter le et geter le de cel perill ; et c'il autrement ne le peut faire, il li doit doner son cheval ou sa beste sur quei il chevauche, c'il la requiert, et aider le a metre sur, et aider le a son pooir a son cors sauver."

to make it *structurally* significant. Just as Arthur became king through Escalibor, so through Escalibor Gawain had to become a knight; and the two incidents—the drawing of the sword from the stone and the dubbing of Gawain with the same sword—had to be placed symmetrically, one at the beginning, the other exactly half-way through the romance, so that the two phases in the fortunes of Escalibor should seem complementary and indeed essential to each other. This was precisely what the author of the *Estoire de Merlin* did, intent as he was on combining coherence and balance amidst all the complexities of his narrative. Both methods—the rational and the structural—are at the root of the development of the thirteenth-century cyclic romances, of their elaborate episodic sequences, of their prodigious expansion and growth; and significantly enough, the resulting convolutions of narrative patterns are reminiscent on the one hand of the constructive subtlety of certain types of scholasticism and on the other of the linear fantasy of Romanesque ornamentation.

But this is not the last nor perhaps the most remarkable phase in the history of Escalibor. Another continuation of Robert de Borron's *Merlin* appeared in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, a continuation known under the unimaginative title of *La Suite du Merlin*.¹ Both intrinsically and historically, it is a work of outstanding importance. It was written primarily with the object of elucidating and re-interpreting the two final phases of the Arthurian epic, the Grail quest and the fall of Arthur's kingdom. The theme of Arthur's sword as presented in the final section of the prose *Lancelot*, the *Mort Artu*, and the moving and majestic scene in which the dying king orders his good sword to be cast into a lake were among the features which naturally called for elucidation. That Arthur should wish to know his sword in safe keeping before he dies is understandable, as understandable as Roland's desire to break his Durendal lest it fell

¹ Sometimes referred to as the "Huth *Merlin*". Alfred Huth was the owner of the then only known manuscript published in 1886 by Gaston Paris and Jacob Ulrich (*Merlin, roman en prose du XIII^e siècle*, S.A.T.F.). A more complete manuscript, now in the Cambridge University Library, came to light in 1945. Cf. my "Genèse de la Suite de Merlin" in *Mélanges de philologie romane et de littérature médiévale offerts à Ernest Hoepffner* (Paris, 1949), pp. 295-300.

into the hands of the Saracens ; but was it not enough to let Escalibor sink to the bottom of the lake and remain there forever ? Why should a mysterious arm come out of the water and remove Escalibor into a world which lies beyond the boundaries of any human kingdom ? And if Escalibor was the sword which Arthur drew from the anvil before he became king, what connection, if any, was there between these two supernatural happenings ? There was something obscure and structurally incomplete in the story as the prose *Lancelot* had left it, and both the obscurity and the structural deficiency had to be removed if the story was to conform to more exacting standards of composition. The author of the new continuation of the *Merlin* set about this task with determination and skill. He realized that the first thing to do was to separate the theme of the sword in the stone from that of the sword thrown into the lake. With this object in mind he introduced a long series of incidents supposed to have taken place soon after Arthur's coronation. The newly crowned king, armed with the sword which he has taken from the stone, challenges a mysterious knight who dwells in a forest and compels all those who pass to joust with him. In a long and fierce combat Arthur is unhorsed and his sword splintered to pieces against that of his opponent. He is miraculously saved by the timely appearance of Merlin, but another sword must now be found for him, and it must be strong enough to last him all his life. Merlin leads Arthur to the edge of a lake ; from beneath the waters rises an arm in a sleeve of rich silk holding a sword. A mysterious lady then appears " par deviers la mer ", and using an invisible bridge to reach the centre of the lake she takes the sword and gives it to Arthur. It is this sword which will henceforth bear the name Escalibor.¹ And when Arthur's last hour comes the hand that held this sword above the water will receive it from him and restore it to the enchanted place it came from : the story of Escalibor will have come full circle.

¹ In a passage reproduced from the *Estoire de Merlin* in the Cambridge MS. of the *Suite* (Add. 7071), which probably represents an earlier version of the work than does the Huth MS. (B. M. Add. MS. 38117), the sword drawn from the anvil is also called Escalibor (fol. 206 recto, col. 1). The inconsistency reappears in Malory's *Tale of King Arthur* which is based on a text very similar to the Cambridge MS. Cf. my edition of *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, pp. 19 and 65.

To find out how this story came to be composed all we need do is to think of it in purely structural terms, and of the author as being above all anxious to achieve as complete and as balanced a composition as his material would allow. For such an author it was essential that the theme of the sword thrown into the lake should be supported by a parallel theme, that of the sword which came from the depths of the lake, and this paramount necessity accounts for all his innovations. Some may feel that in his endeavour to correct what he thought was a deficiency in his original he deprived the story of a valuable feature : he removed the link between Arthur's first exploit and his death on the battlefield, for the sword which vanishes in the lake to mark the end of Arthur's reign is no longer the one which secured his accession to the throne.¹ But there is ample compensation for this in the invention of other, more important links, in the suggestive value of parallel situations, in the skilful repetition "in reverse" which is accompanied here by a significant change of key and a darkening of tone. Several famous examples of this type of structure come to mind, ranging from the *Chanson de Roland* to Dante and beyond. When Roland's confidence gives way to the certainty of defeat and he decides to sound the horn to call Charlemagne back, his dialogue with Oliver is an ironical *reprise* in reverse of the earlier scene in which he refused to call for help in spite of Oliver's well-reasoned insistence. A still more expressive parallelism runs through the story of Tristan and Iseult as told by twelfth-century French poets : Tristan's last message to Iseult, sent in despair across the seas, echoes the first disguised message from Iseult to Tristan—her golden hair carried by two swallows to Mark's court ; and when Tristan, dying of a poisoned wound, is waiting for Iseult's white sail to appear on the stormy sea, our minds go back to his journey in a rudderless boat to Ireland where he saw Iseult for the first time and she healed the wound inflicted on him by Morholt, a wound which she alone could heal. This is something different from the

¹ In the *Coming of Arthur* Tennyson makes an interesting attempt to restore the continuity :

I beheld Excalibur
Before him at his crowning borne, the sword
That rose from out the bosom of the lake.

rudimentary kind of parallelism that we noticed in the *Estoire de Merlin*: the change of key, the contrast of light and shade give meaning and movement to the pattern of parallel events and make the entire structure into a living thing. The only example of this method in the earlier history of Escalibor is the contrast between the two scenes in the prose *Lancelot*: that in which Gawain saves Lancelot's life by arming him with Escalibor and the fateful moment when he attacks Lancelot, his best friend, with Escalibor, thus bringing about his own undoing and the ultimate downfall of Arthurian chivalry. That Escalibor is not just a weapon which can rescue and destroy, but a symbolic expression of the great tragic theme of divided loyalties, is made apparent by the characteristic structural relationship of the two scenes, eloquently contrasted, and raised to a new level of meaning.

In the *Suite du Merlin* the same device is used with still greater effect. The hand which receives the sword and vanishes with it no longer represents, as it did in the earlier version, an occasional intrusion of magic upon Arthur's world. The sword which Arthur surrenders to those dark powers when his kingdom is lost is the one they once bestowed upon him to make his reign glorious; it stands for the continuity of his fate, his rise to greatness and his fall, for it is placed as it were within the enchanted circle irrevocably drawn around him and his kingdom. Whatever the reasons for the final disaster, all we are told is *how* it occurred, how the same mysterious power that brought Arthur and his knights to the height of their wordly fame wrought their misfortune and their doom. And just as Gawain's love for Lancelot gave true significance to their encounter on the battle-field, so the fairy tale with which the story opens when the Lady of the Lake walks over the invisible bridge to get Arthur's sword for him gives true meaning to the final surrender of the sword, when Arthur's last surviving companion, Grifflet, casts it far out into the lake. Neither of these phases of Arthur's unfathomable destiny would have been the same without the other: they amplify and enrich each other like contrasting voices in a choral fugue. And the import of the event is all the greater for being implicit in the contrast.

To single out a theme such as Arthur's sword and interpret it,

as I have attempted to do, with reference to so wide an issue is a hazardous enterprise, and some may feel that too generous a use has been made in these pages of the simple virtues of Excalibur. But the method happens to be consistent with the nature of the material. The fashion nowadays is to treat medieval romances either as the antecedents of the modern psychological novel or as survivals of a forgotten pre-literary civilization. What is seldom realized is that their authors thought of them neither as records of folklore nor as examples of "psychological characterization through action", but as narratives consisting of themes and patterns of themes, or, to use a phrase favoured by Ernst Curtius, "configurations and systems of configurations". Crystallized into a variety of structural designs, the narrative matter of romance grows in complexity and subtlety with each successive writer until it is caught in a movement reminiscent of the higher forms of musical composition. It is this movement that the novelists of our own century have for some time been endeavouring to recapture, and it was some such movement that Thomas Mann had in mind when he said that for him the art of the novel was the art of the fugue. The Arthurian fugue has barely begun to yield its secret. And any light thrown upon its inner mechanism and texture would mark an advance towards a better understanding of the deepest and least visible foundations of imaginative prose.

FREDEGAR AND THE HISTORY OF FRANCE ¹

By J. M. WALLACE-HADRILL, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF MEDIEVAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF MANCHESTER

ABOUT the year A.D. 660 there died a certain Burgundian known to us, though perhaps not to his friends, as Fredegar or Fredegarius. We have no evidence earlier than the sixteenth century that he was so called, though Fredegar is an authentic Frankish name. He left behind him what, in a word, may be called a chronicle; and it is because of his chronicle, though it is no longer extant in its original form, that posterity is at all bothered with him.

This chronicle was of the nature of a private record that would have been known to very few; and, moreover, it was never finished. Even so, someone (one suspects from a local monastic or cathedral scriptorium, Chalon-sur-Saône perhaps, or Lyons or Luxeuil) got to know of Fredegar's manuscript, and made a copy of it, about a generation later. It was a bad copy, and it was a copy made for a special purpose: bad, because the scribe made heavy weather of the Merovingian cursive before him (his own writing is uncial); and for a special purpose, because he shaped Fredegar, with certain additions and subtractions, into what has been called a clerical *Lesebuch*. His inscription, where he reveals himself as the monk Lucerius, can still be read. Such as it is, this *Lesebuch* survives: it is a Paris manuscript, Bibl. Nat. Latin 10910, the basis of Bruno Krusch's *Monumenta* edition of Fredegar, and the basis, in my opinion, of any future edition worth the name.² Apart from this, we have some thirty other

¹ Based on a paper read to the Anglo-American Historical Conference in London on 9 July 1955.

² The standard edition is that of Bruno Krusch in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum*, vol. ii (1888). My own forthcoming edition of Book IV and the Continuations of the Chronicle discusses in greater detail some of the matters raised in this paper and includes a full bibliography.

manuscripts of Fredegar (two of them Harleian manuscripts),¹ descended either, as Krusch held, from the clerical *Lesebuch* or from another copy of the original manuscript made at about the same time. None of those we have is older than the early ninth century, from which it may be inferred that Fredegar came into his own rather suddenly in the Carolingian age. He was copied, in whole or in part, throughout the Rhineland and Northern France, from Mehrerau near Lake Constance through Lorsch and Reims to the monasteries of the Ardennes; and he came to be associated, as one might expect, with copies of the Neustrian *Liber Historiae Francorum*, with Einhard, Bede and other historians. The St. Gallen MS. 547 is a good example of such an association. Fredegar was recognized as history—and as official history, at that. This came about because an early copy of the chronicle (of the late eighth century, it may be) travelled north into Austrasia and came to rest in some Carolingian stronghold, perhaps Metz. The subsequent proliferation of copies is from Austrasia, not from Burgundy. Here Fredegar had the good fortune to fall into the hands of the great family of the Nibelungen, close connections of the Carolingians through the Lady Alpaida, wife of Charles Martel; or rather, into the hands of a scribe employed by them to put together a chronicle of Frankish events as seen through Carolingian eyes. This chronicle, the work of several writers, is now known as the continuation of Fredegar; and though its ethos is in important respects unlike his own, it survives only in association with him. We may call the resulting amalgam official because, under the year 751, the continuator writes:

Up to this point, the illustrious Count Childebrand, uncle of the said King Pippin, took great pains to have this history or “geste” of the Franks recorded. What follows is by the authority of the illustrious Count Nibelung, Childebrand’s son (Cont. chap. 35).

Almost all our copies of Fredegar are found in this Austrasian guise, and quite naturally Fredegar reached the Middle Ages in the wake of the historical Nibelungen and under their *auctoritas*, carefully copied in great scriptoria that would not otherwise have known him. They made brave but unavailing efforts to

¹Harley 5251 and 3771. Their contents are described in the *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum*, pt. ii (Latin), (1884), pp. 84-5.

“correct” his highly individual Latin. By this route, too, he first reached the dignity of print, in the pages of Flacius Illyricus (Basel, 1568), Canisius, Scaliger, Freherus and others. Ruinart, in 1699, was the first editor to use a manuscript not of the Austrasian tradition. But my concern is less with the respectable manuscripts of that tradition than with the little uncial *Lesebuch*, and what lay behind it. It contains, as it stands, the following items :

The *Liber Generationis*,¹ a Latin translation of the Chronicle of Hippolytus, with additions ; the *Supputatio Eusebii-Hieronimi*, a computation from Adam to the first year of the reign of King Sigibert (613) ; a list of popes to the accession of Pope Theodore (642) later completed to the sixteenth year of Pope Hadrian I (788) ; the beginning of the Chronicle of Isidore of Seville, dealing with the creation of the world ; lists of patriarchs, kings and emperors, stopping at the thirty-first year of Heraclius I (640-1) ; interpolated extracts from the Chronicle of Eusebius, in St. Jerome’s version ; interpolated extracts from the Chronicle of Hydatius, itself a continuation of St. Jerome ; a résumé or *Historia Epitomata* of the first six books of the History of Gregory of Tours, stopping at 584 ; an original chronicle in ninety chapters from the twenty-fourth year of King Guntram of Burgundy (584, described by the chronicler as the beginning of the end of his reign) to the death of Flaochad, mayor of the Burgundian palace, in 642 ; extracts from the Chronicle of Isidore, with an *explicit* dated the fortieth year of the reign of King Chlotar (623-4)

A succession of scholars has tackled this intractable list, and though they do not agree about much, they do mostly agree that the order of contents is not quite as Fredegar left it, and in particular that Isidore has become displaced from his rightful position as it is revealed in the important prologue that I shall cite later on. My own impression of how the chronicle was put together is as follows. Early in the seventh century a, to us, anonymous Burgundian decided to attach to some local annals a short chronicle of his own. The annals seem to have covered the

¹ M. L. W. Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe* (2nd. edn., 1957), p. 178, has, by inadvertance, confused this with the *Liber Generationum*, the work of an African writer of the fifth century.

period 584-604, though they may have gone back further. His chronicle covers the period 604-13. To this collection I think he added (though it might have happened later) a kind of hand-book of world-chronology: it comprised Jerome, Hydatius, Isidore and the *Liber Generationis*, though I would not be sure about their order. He may have found this hand-book, or he may have put it together for himself; one cannot tell. In any event, his maximum contribution was a chronological hand-book, some Burgundian annals and a short chronicle covering the decade between the ninth year of King Theuderic and the execution of Queen Brunichildis. And of course he brought up to date his chronological lists, so far as he was able. His work shows no exceptional knowledge and no indication that he held a privileged position. After a pause of another decade, his work was resumed by a second chronicler of very different calibre; and, to cut a long story short, this is the man with some claim to recognition and respect. Since it is a convenience to preserve the name, let him be Fredegar; let him be so, moreover, without the pedantic prefix "Pseudo". He is distinguishable from his predecessor on two grounds; first, his interests and, secondly, his style. A succession of French historians—Lot, Baudot and Levillain¹—have argued for the unity of the whole chronicle and have emphasized (what is true) that chroniclers took their material where they could get it, so that differences in approach do not necessarily reveal different writers. But when these coincide with differences in style, as here, then surely we must allow multiple, or at least dual, authorship. German scholars, starting a century ago with Brosien and ending with Krusch, Hellmann and Levison,² have left, as I see it, nothing of the case for single

¹ F. Lot, "Encore la Chronique du Pseudo-Frédégaire", *Revue Historique*, vol. cxv (1914); M. Baudot, "La question du Pseudo-Frédégaire", *Le Moyen Age*, vol. xxix (1928); L. Levillain, critical review of Krusch in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, vol. lxxxix (1928).

² B. Krusch, "Die Chronicae des sogenannten Fredegar", *Neues Archiv*, vol. vii (1882); "Fredegarius Scholasticus—Oudarius? Neue Beiträge zur Fredegar—Kritik", *Nachr. der Gesellschaft der Wiss. zu Göttingen, philol.-hist. cl.* (1926), pt. 2; S. Hellmann, "Das Fredegarproblem", *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, vol. xxix (1934); W. Levison, critical review of Baudot in *Jahresberichte der deutschen Geschichte* (1928); Wattenbach-Levison, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (Weimar, 1952).

authorship, however little they may have agreed among themselves about the number of authors. Indeed, we may well ask how often the phenomenon of single authorship of a medieval chronicle did occur: the more skins of the onion one pulls off, the more one finds beneath. We may possibly be faced with three authors, as Krusch argued: namely, the Burgundian who took the chronicle to 613, then Fredegar, and finally an Austrasian interpolater; but, at the least, we are faced with two, if, with Hellmann, we discard the Austrasian, as I fancy we should. Fredegar writes a different language from that of his predecessor; so different that even his interpolations in the earlier work are sometimes distinguishable. There is nothing subjective about this: we are faced with distinctive linguistic uses—uses of anacoluthon, of adverbs and adjectives, of relative clauses, ablatives absolute, participles in apposition and aorist participles, and with two vocabularies. The first stands nearer to the syntactical usages of Late Antiquity, while the second—a man of vivider and more allusive mind—struggles against a fuller tittle of Romance influence on Latin. His language is extremely interesting; and one might hesitate to call it barbarous because it is consistent. But Fredegar's history, and not his language, is our present concern. I wish merely to emphasize that his language would distinguish him from his predecessor if nothing else did.

It is a reasonable guess that Fredegar was a Burgundian, like his predecessor, and quite possibly a native of the *Pagus Ultra-juranus*, from Avenches. We can hazard this because an interpolation in Jerome's Chronicle shows that he knew that Avenches (Roman *Aventicum*) was also locally called Wiffisburg, a name that can only just have been coming into use. It would not be surprising if he were also a layman¹ and a man of some

¹ It will be recalled that Merovingian chancery administration seems largely to have been in the hands of laymen, and that literacy among members of the Gallo-Frankish aristocracy was not then so rare as it was to become. Nor is it surprising that Fredegar, though a layman, should lay stress on the Christian attributes of kingship. See the remarks of E. Ewig in *Das Königtum* (Konstanz, 1956), pp. 21 ff. In my opinion, the case for considering Fredegar a layman must rest mainly on what he does *not* say; a churchman would have evinced a more specialized knowledge and interest at several points in the story which Fredegar allows to pass without comment.

standing in the Burgundian court of the mid-seventh century. He had access to official documents like the so-called Treaty of Andelot ; he was able to interview Frankish envoys and others returning from foreign parts, as, for example, from Byzantium, from the Visigothic and Lombard courts, or from the Slavs ; and he had personal knowledge of, and views about, the great men of his world, especially the mayors of the palace. He seems to have had the use of the official correspondence of King Sisebut of Spain, to say nothing of the archives of more than one Burgundian church, notably Geneva. Yet his writing is in no sense officially inspired, like that of his far-off continuators, even though it benefits from being put together in informed circles. To identify him more closely than that, and, in particular, to accept Baudot's identification of him with the Count Berthar who makes three appearances in the chronicle, is to indulge fancy too far.

How did Fredegar go to work ? He somehow acquired his predecessor's manuscript, and thus had before him a chronicle covering those ten years of Frankish history that closed with the horrible end of Brunechildis—the end, equally, of the most famous vendetta in Frankish history. It left Chlotar II sole master of the *Regnum Francorum*. To the chronicle was already attached a series of Burgundian annals, going back, at least, to the year 584, and probably also the hand-book of world-chronology, though a case can be made for Fredegar having added this on his own account. We must picture Fredegar consulting this collection, correcting it and adding to it over a period of years. His work was spasmodic, and there were probably gaps of several years in which he did nothing at all. He may have started round about the year 625 ; and what I think he did first was to construct a bridge between the end of his predecessor's chronicle and the date at which he himself was writing. Thus we have, for the decade 614 to 624, a series of rather scrappy notes that nonetheless serve their purpose. Then he begins to revise the other man's work. Into the *Liber Generationis*, Jerome, Hydatius and Isidore he inserts material of his own—some of it of great interest. He then adds, as a very necessary transition from world-history to the story of his own small world, an epitome of the first six books of Gregory of Tours' History, again with his own inter-

polations, taking the story to 584. He would at this point have sacrificed any earlier part of the Burgundian annals that there may have been. Thus he had what he probably called five chronicles : the *Liber*, Jerome, Hydatius, Isidore and Gregory ; and to them he proceeded to add a sixth, namely the annals and chronicle of his Burgundian predecessor, continued by himself from 614. This is really a notable compilation. But it is only at the year 625 that his own uninhibited writing begins. From there to 642 we are given a detailed, exciting and chaotic narrative : chaotic in large part because not written on a year-to-year basis. As and when he had the material, and perhaps the leisure, he would add a section covering several years, or would insert a chapter in the earlier material (the famous chapter about Samo and the Wends is an example) or would alter a fact. However, his work bears traces of being unfinished. It ends, abruptly, with a very long description of the vendetta between Willibad and Flaochad, respectively the patrician and the mayor of Burgundy, in 642. In the nature of things, had he had the chance, he would surely have described the settlement of Burgundy that followed. But he was adding material as late as 660. For some reason that cannot now, or yet, be determined, the narrative was never continued beyond 642. He had, it is true, already written his preface or prologue to the whole work, and to this I shall presently turn ; but prologues were not always written last, and there is no apparent reason why his narrative should have stopped where it did, except by chance. Chapter 81 ends with the words : " How this came about I shall set down under the right year if, God willing, I finish this and other matters as I desire ; and so I shall include everything in this book that I know to be true ". It may be that he was getting more interested in turning his collection into a great source-book, and this is what he seems to imply in his prologue. The narrative, consequently, got shelved. He had not divided his six chronicles into four books, as they appear in the earliest extant manuscript, nor had he sub-divided his personal chronicle into the chapters that now, in places, make nonsense of them. All that is later work.

Having said this much, by way of introduction, about Fredegar himself, and having briefly described what is in his

chronicle and how it got there, I now turn to why it got there ; in short, to the problem of Fredegar's rôle among the historians of France. The beginning of wisdom in this matter must be Fredegar's own statement in his prologue. It was composed as a prologue to the whole work, and not simply to Book IV (that is, the sixth chronicle), as it will be found in Krusch's edition. This is what Fredegar says, beginning with an excerpt from St. Jerome :

Unless the Almighty helps me, I cannot tell how I can express in a word the labour on which I am embarking and how, in striving to succeed, my long struggle devours days already too short. "Translator" ¹ in our own vernacular gives the wrong sense, for if I feel bound to change somewhat the order of words, I should appear not to abide by a translator's duty.² I have most carefully read the chronicles of St. Jerome, of Hydatius, of a certain wise man,³ of Isidore and of Gregory, from the beginning of the world to the decline of Guntramn's reign ; and I have reproduced successively in this little book, in suitable language and without many omissions, what these learned men have recounted at length in their five chronicles. Further,⁴ I have judged it necessary to be more thorough in my striving for accuracy, and so I have noted in the above-mentioned chronicles, as it were a source of material for a future work, all the reigns of the kings and their chronology. I have brought together and put into order in these pages, as exactly as I can, this chronology and the doings of many peoples, and have inserted them in the chronicles (a Greek word, meaning in Latin the record of the years) compiled by these wise men—chronicles that copiously gush like a spring most pure.⁵ I could have wished that I had the same command of language, or at least approached it ; but it is harder to draw from a spring that gushes intermittently. And now the world grows old, which is why the finer points of wisdom are lost to us. Nobody now is equal to the orators of past times, or could even pretend to equality. Thus I am compelled, so far as my rusticity and ignorance permit, to hand on, as briefly as possible, whatever I have learned from the books of which I have spoken ; and if any reader doubts me, he has only to turn to the same author to find that I have said nothing but the truth. At the end of Gregory's work I have not fallen silent but have continued on my own account with facts and deeds of later times, finding them wherever they were recorded, and relating of the deeds of kings and of the wars of peoples all that I have read or heard or seen that I can vouch for. Here I have tried to put in all I could discover from the point at which Gregory stopped writing, that is, from the death of King Chilperic.

On the whole, this is as modest, and even as commonplace, a statement of aims as it appears ; but not quite. One catches in

¹ *Interpretator*.

² So far St. Jerome.

³ He means the author of the *Liber*.

⁴ He resumes his citation of Jerome.

⁵ *Velut purissimus fons largiter fluentia manantes*. Professor Laistner has suggested to me that he is likely to have built up this phrase from glossaries.

it, so to say, premonitions of Bede's insistence on accuracy about sources, echoes of Gregory's profession of *rusticitas*, and of Sidonius' lament on the growing-old of the world, to say nothing of a good foundation of Jerome and thus of Eusebius himself. Yet it is a personal statement. Fredegar wishes it to be understood that he has not just accepted the chronicles of the wise men whose command of language is so far beyond his own ; he has collected and inserted into their pages the chronology and the deeds of kings and the doings of many peoples that were not there before ; and he has continued with a chronicle of his own times, relating all that he had read or heard or seen that he could vouch for. If he is ignorant he is careful not to claim for himself an ignorance beyond that of his contemporaries.

What has he inserted into the old chronicles ? A foretaste appears in chapter 5 of the first chronicle (the *Liber Generationis*). Into the list of the descendants of Japhet are interpolated two words : *Trociane, Frigiiae*. He wishes it to be understood that the Trojans and especially such of them as the Frigii, or Franks as he later explains, as made their way west, could trace their descent to a respectable son of Noah. He starts off the second chronicle (Jerome) with the *Regnum Assyriorum* ; but it soon becomes clear that the history of Assyria, or of any other of the great empires, is not his real concern ; they are introduced as a traditional framework and because the regnal years of their rulers give him a chronology. This is why we find in chapter 10 the founding of Carthage, in chapter 15 the end of the Assyrian empire, in chapter 16 the founding of Rome and in chapter 23 the end of the empire of the Medes ; these are used as chronological reckoning-points. His historical interests are two-fold : first, he is intrigued by the history of the Jews in so far as their religion was the fore-runner of Christianity (hence the importance, to him, of Isidore's chronicle) ; and secondly, he has a particular interest in one corner of Greek history, though whatever is irrelevant to this interest he sets aside. This corner is the Trojan origin of the Franks : Fredegar is the first author to mention it. It is not now my intention to examine this matter at all closely. Briefly and in general, it is accepted that we have here a conceit, invention or misunderstanding, ultimately, though

not necessarily directly, based on some literary knowledge ; and whether or not we attribute it to Fredegar's imagination, as does Faral in the celebrated appendix to his *Légende Arthurienne*¹ or to somebody else's, might not seem much to the purpose. My own suspicion is that Faral was too definite about what was and what was not " invention ", and too quickly dismissed the possibilities of a Gaulish origin of the Frankish legend. We have to remember that, in one form or another, tales of Troy were familiar to educated Gauls of the Later Empire. The *Excidium Troiae*² is one instance of this, and shows us the Troy legend in a tradition distinct from the better-known versions of Dares and Dictys,³ and in a guise that strongly suggests Gaulish composition. Ammianus (*Rer. Gest. Lib. XV, 9, 5*) tells of fugitive Trojans settling in Gaul, and Ausonius (*Lib. VI, Epitaphia Heroum*) sings of the heroes of the Trojan War. On these and other grounds, it is quite reasonable to attribute Hellenic tastes to the Gallo-Romans and to see, as does Pierre Courcelle, something like a Greek renaissance in Gaul in the later fifth century.⁴ It must, then, be borne in mind that the Gaulish atmosphere was already impregnated with *Trojana* by the time the Franks arrived, so that we might expect a Frankish-Trojan connection too at any time from the fifth century. It surfaces, however, in the literary sense, with Fredegar ; and what we have to face is the undoubted fact that Fredegar, and perhaps also his predecessor, propagated a very powerful fiction. This is contained in a series of interpolations in chapters 4 to 7 of St. Jerome. In brief, the story, if we ignore certain contradictions that may be due to dual authorship, is that the first king of the Franks was Priam. His people

¹ E. Faral, *La Légende Arthurienne* (*Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études*, fasc. 255) (1929), i. App. 1.

² Edited by E. B. Atwood and V. K. Whitaker, *Medieval Academy of America* (Cambridge, Mass., 1944).

³ The reports of Dares and Dictys, alleged eyewitnesses of the Trojan war, add nothing to the story of the ancestry of the Franks. In the free adaptation of Dares that was incorporated in some manuscripts of Fredegar's Chronicle, there is mention of the Trojan princes Francus and Vassus. See Faral, *op. cit.* i. 287-8, and E. Zöllner, *Die politische Stellung der Völker im Frankenreich* (Vienna, 1950), pp. 70-1.

⁴ *Les Lettres grecques en Occident* (2nd. edn. 1948), pp. 210-53. The conclusions of this study have, however, been attacked by Ferdinand Lot and others.

split into two main groups (a third, the Teucri, went off to become Turks), and of these one made its way into Macedonia as a mercenary force and became absorbed into the population. This may have some connection with the legend of the Pannonian origin of the Franks reported by Gregory of Tours and, as Dill thought, with the decision of the Emperor Probus to exile a band of recalcitrant Franks to the Black Sea area in the third century.¹ The second main group, the Frigii—and here is Fredegar's novelty—set forth under a king named Francio, whence their subsequent name, Franks (an etymology probably due to Isidore, who at the same time suggests the right one).² Under the valiant Francio they devastated part of Asia, turned west into Europe, and finally established themselves between the Rhine, the Danube and the sea. There Francio died, and his people, reduced in numbers by all their wars, chose thereafter to be governed by dukes. They did very well against the Romans—notably against Pompey, whom we find an emperor, busy fighting the German tribes. The Franks and the Saxons were alone able to resist him: “post haec nulla gens usque in presentem diem Francos potuit superare, qui tamen eos suae dicione potuissent subiugare”. Where, asked Kurth, will you find a comparable Frankish boast, apart from the longer prologue of *Lex Salica*?³ In chapter 8 we then begin to cover some of the same ground again. Friga, of the house of Priam, was, we are now told, actually the brother of Aeneas, and thus the Latins too were the kindred of the Franks. A little later on, in the fifth chronicle (the epitome of Gregory) Fredegar has to explain away Gregory's much more cautious statement on Frankish origins with a careful interpolation or so of his own. In particular, he now states that when they reached the Rhine, the Franks started to build a city

¹ *Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age* (1926), p. 6.

² *Etymologiarum*, Lib. IX, ii. 101 (ed. W. M. Lindsay, Oxford, 1911, i).

³ *Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens* (1893), p. 511. He might perhaps have added, in King Chilperic's account to Gregory of his great golden dish—“ego haec ad exornandam atque nobilitandam Francorum gentem feci” (*Historiarum Libri*, ed. Krusch and Levison, *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* (1951), Lib. VI, Cap. 2). Kurth's famous appendix on the Trojan origin of the Franks champions the view that Fredegar's story was an erudite invention. Camille Jullian, on the other hand, held that the story went back to the fourth century (*De la Gaule à la France*, p. 200).

named Troy, but the work was never completed. All sorts of explanations have been advanced of this passage. Faral believed that Fredegar is here caught out at an "invention audacieuse", and that he got his idea from Gregory, who says that when the Franks had crossed the Rhine they passed through Thuringia: "Thoringiam transmeasse"; and Thuringia becomes Trojia. This may be thought a good deal wilder than the attempts of Mommsen and others to find a suitable Troy among the cities of the Rhineland. Xanten is a reasonable candidate; and next door to Xanten was ancient Colonia Traiana, known in the Middle Ages as Troja Minor. Xanten was re-settled perhaps at about the time when Fredegar was writing, and took its name—Ad Sanctos—from the Martyrs' Church that alone survived of the former Colonia Traiana, destroyed in the mid-fifth century. Archaeologists have recently been busy on the site.¹ There are difficulties about this identification, naturally; but it is quite likely that the Austrasian Franks of the seventh century had made it for themselves, and that Fredegar was here not inventing but reporting; it was one of the things he had heard. Really the most conclusive argument against Fredegar as author of the Frankish-Trojan legend is its presence, in a different guise, in the Neustrian *Liber Historiæ Francorum*, put together in the early eighth century.² The author of the *Liber* made no use of Fredegar, and had never even heard of him. They are independent witnesses to a tale which they inevitably give in different forms.

I do not attempt to disentangle the various strands of the Trojan legend as known to Fredegar. It is enough to draw attention to the part it plays in his story. He has found a distinguished, even an epic, background for his Franks, and has got them to the Rhine, free and independent under their dukes and well able to stand up to the Romans, to whom they are related. This is a far better story than Gregory managed. Taken as a whole, it satisfies racial pride in a new way; it incapsulates the Franks in the history of the great powers of the

¹ See H. von Petrikovits' "Die Ausgrabungen der Colonia Traiana bei Xanten", *Bonner Jahrbücher*, clii (1952), 41-161.

² Edited by Krusch in M.G.H., *Script. Rer. Mero.*, Lib. II (1888).

Mediterranean world, namely the Church of Rome and the Eastern Empire, while at the same time giving them the dignity of historical independence.¹ Chapters 27 and 30 of the second chronicle contain some very interesting interpolations designed to show the completeness and speed of those Roman victories that never included the subjugation of the Franks. In chapter 65 the great Emperor Pompey conquers most of Asia; and it is now safe to call him *genere Francus* merely because he is a Roman, and thus ultimately a Trojan. Fredegar is really very skilled at working his interpolations of barbarian history into the fabric of Jerome and Hydatius. He finds room for a brief chapter (46) on the Burgundians, which may, in substance, come from Marius of Avenches; but it is certainly a pointer to what may be called his own domestic interests. He does not think much of the historical Burgundians, and, for all we know, did not consider himself descended from them. On the whole, Fredegar's pride in Frankish blood suggests that he did not carefully distinguish between indigenous and other races in his own Burgundy any more than he did in a wider field. Whatever his blood, whether Frankish or Burgundian in the narrow sense, he would probably have called himself *Romanus*. In chapter 56 he repeats the story of Hydatius, that in the second year of the reign of Anthemius blood spurted from the ground in the middle of Toulouse and continued to spurt for a whole day; but he has his own explanation of this: "signeficans, Gothorum dominatione sublata, Francorum adveniente regno". As the barbarian people move increasingly to the forefront of his picture, so it is natural that he should turn from Hydatius to Isidore's chronicle; and as attention becomes increasingly focused on one people, the Franks, so a transition to Gregory becomes equally natural. Gregory's epitome is the bridge between universal history into which Frankish matter is interpolated and Frankish history into which universal matter is interpolated. Fredegar omits Gregory's first book, which was logical, since its latest entry concerns the death of St. Martin and its subject-matter is thus Gallo-Roman and not Frankish. He begins with Gregory's account of the

¹ See the remarks of Helmut Beumann in *Das Königtum* (Konstanz, 1956), p. 223.

collapse of the Vandal Kingdom¹ and so arrives at the Franks, their origin and their history, immediately before their push into northern Gaul.²

This is no place for a systematic survey of all the interpolations in the text of Gregory that must be laid at the door of Fredegar. Some are of a purely factual nature, for example in Burgundian affairs, and take the form of a place-name here or a proper-name there that Gregory did not know and Fredegar did know. Others look rather like additions made from folk-tale or hearsay or, using the term in the limited sense employed by Dr. C. E. Wright, from saga;³ and this is just as we have been warned to expect. A few examples must suffice. In chapter 9 comes Fredegar's explanation of the birth of Meroveus, the eponymous hero of the Frankish royal house. Chlodio was taking a summer bathe in the sea with his wife when she was approached by a sea-beast, "bistea Neptuni Quinitauri similis. . . . Cumque in continuo aut a bistea aut a viro fuisset concepta, peperit filium nomen Meroveum, per quo regis Francorum post vocantur Merovingii." I draw attention to Fredegar's note of doubt: the Minotaur *may* not have been the father of Meroveus; it may really have been a man. But, anyway, that is the story as reported to him. The Franks have not been content with Gregory's more sober account and have used their imagination. There are other stories of the same flavour as, for example, Clovis' wooing of the Burgundian Chrotechildis (chs. 18-19) and Basina's experiences on her wedding night (ch. 12). As is well known, Basina thrice roused her husband, Childeric (father of Clovis), and sent him out into the night to report what he should see; and he saw, the first time, lions, unicorns and leopards; and the

¹ *Historiarum Libri*, ed. Krusch and Levison, M.G.H., *Script. Rer. Mero.* (1951), *Lib. II*, cap. 9.

² It is perhaps worth noting that Fredegar makes no mention of the Franks having participated in the *Adventus* of Germanic tribes into Roman Britain. If the blood of the Kentish settlers had been predominantly Frankish, one might expect to find some reflection of that migration in Frankish literature, whether or not those settlers had been led by their own chieftains, and whether they hailed from the Middle Rhine, as Mr. Jolliffe believed (*Pre-Feudal England, the Jutes*, 1933) or from the Lower Rhine, as Professor Hawkes argues ("The Jutes in Kent", in *Dark-Age Britain*, 1956). Franks were one thing, Frisians another.

³ *The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England* (1939).

second time, bears and wolves; and the third time, lesser beasts like dogs, and beasts "ab invicem detrahentes et voluntantes". She interprets this as the successive stages of degeneration of the Merovingian dynasty: Clovis shall be like a lion, his sons like leopards and unicorns, and their sons like bears and wolves and, finally, the fourth generation shall be like dogs and lesser beasts, and their people shall devastate one another "sine timore principum". Let us admit that this is hearsay; but is it, as Dill says, "popular legend"? I should suspect it of being not a countryman's tale but the kind of gloss that an informed public, even an aristocratic circle, might put upon events. It could even have some still undiscovered literary origin. The comment is that of a man quite capable of analysing the political troubles of his own time, who yet wishes to see no alternative to his Merovingians and thinks his compatriots a great deal more impressive than their kindred in Spain and Italy and elsewhere.

There are other long interpolations that equally deserve attention, such, for instance, as the story of Childeric's exile in Byzantium and eventual restoration through the guile of his friend Wiomad the Hun (ch. 11). Although Fredegar gets the name of the then Eastern Emperor wrong, there seems to lie behind his tale a tradition that Childeric, recently described by Professor Charles Verlinden as "only the chief of a warrior band",¹ actually owed his rule in Gaul to imperial backing as a rival candidate to the rebel Aegidius. This is worth reflecting upon. Fredegar seems to have had a considerable stock of information about Byzantine affairs, whether or not they directly affected Gaul. The reason may lie in the nearness of Burgundy to Byzantine Italy and to the vital route connecting Italy with Septimania. This enabled him to make additions to Gregory's account of the coup d'état of Gundowald, which involved Byzantium (ch. 87), and also to interpolate information on Franco-Lombard contacts (chs. 50, 65, 68). The Burgundian court-circle of Fredegar's day, where he certainly had friends, was more than a place where an occasional messenger could be interviewed; it had a long-standing tradition of contact with

¹ "Frankish Colonization: a new approach", *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, fifth ser., iv (1954), 15.

Byzantium, and must have been a store-house of information about the past. What more likely source for the famous romance of Justinian and Belisarius (II, ch. 61) inserted by Fredegar after Gregory's passage on the end of the Vandalic War? It is the tale of their matrimonial adventures with two Amazon sisters, one of whom—Antonina, wife of Belisarius—holds a command in Africa under her husband. A tissue of nonsense, no doubt; yet Procopius says that Antonina was Belisarius' wife and did accompany her husband on the Vandalic campaign,¹ and elsewhere in the romance is a strange parallel to the life of Pope Vigilius in the *Liber Pontificalis*.² I very much doubt if Fredegar ever set eyes on the writings of Procopius or on the *Liber Pontificalis*. In short, he gave literary shape to an already composite story current in the Mediterranean world and repeated in circles where he moved. Gregory of Tours, for all that he was a Gallo-Roman of the Auvergne with many friends in the Midi, was bishop of a see in western Gaul. He had nothing corresponding to the Burgundian court to keep him regularly informed about the eastern Mediterranean world. It would be foolish to over-emphasize this contrast, for Tours was an Austrasian city and the *Literæ Austrasicæ* show that the kings of Metz also had their dealings with Byzantium;³ it is a long way, however, from Tours to Metz.

But Fredegar looks north as well as south. Among his shorter interpolations should be noticed two important references to Reims. One, well known, is in chapter 21, where he reports that Clovis was baptized by St. Rémi at Reims, a detail not given by Gregory and therefore often regarded as a fabrication,⁴ particularly since it is followed by Clovis' comment on first hearing of our Lord's Passion—that had he been present with his Franks,

¹ *Vandalic War*, III, xii. 2, xiii. 23-4, xix. 11, xx. 1.

² Note the remarks of R. Salamon, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xxx (1929-30), 102-10.

³ A full study of these Frankish-Byzantine contacts has been made by P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam*, vol. ii, pt. 1 (*Byzance et les Francs*) (1956). His conclusions should, however, be treated with caution.

⁴ Most recently in Sir Francis Oppenheimer's *Frankish Themes and Problems* (1952). Reims, however, is preferred by A. H. M. Jones, P. Grierson and J. A. Crook, "The authenticity of the Testamentum S. Remigii", *Rev. Belge de Philol. et d'Hist.*, xxxv (1957), No. 2, 368.

he would soon have avenged the wrong ! But in another place, chapter 16, Fredegar says that the famous vase of the Soissons incident described by Gregory belonged to the church of Reims. So here we have two allusions to Reims by a chronicler with no particular interest in the city or the church. To my mind, this tends to increase the likelihood of their veracity, or at least of Fredegar's acceptance of some local Austrasian source of information, such as a set of annals kept at Reims or at Metz (at least one interpolation suggests a Metz origin : the story in chapter 72 of how Brunehildis let the little Childebert down in a bag from a window in Paris, whence he was carried away to safety at Metz. I also suspect that he used the Metz *Vita Arnulfi*).

This selection of the more characteristic and important of Fredegar's interpolations may serve as a basis for advancing one quite modest claim ; namely, that though, in the main, he accepts and understands Gregory's account of Frankish affairs up to the year 584, he is yet able to make significant additions that probably stem from quite reputable sources, oral and written. He was no fool—and no fabricator, having no need to be one.

Lastly, there is Fredegar's own chronicle—his own, that is, apart from a few introductory chapters. Has it any coherence ? Is it in any sense controlled by a single view of events ? Or is it just an ignorant hotch-potch of whatever came along ? The dominant interest of the first forty-two chapters is not in doubt : it is the vendetta of the Visigoth Brunehildis with her Frankish connections, after the murder of her sister Galswintha. It is more than that : it is an indictment and an analysis. Fredegar is perfectly clear that Brunehildis was at the bottom of all the chaos of Frankish politics : his view is put shortly in an interpolation in Gregory (III, ch. 59)—“ Tanta mala et effusione sanguinum a Brunehildis consilium in Francia factae sunt, ut prophetis Saeville impleretur, dicens ‘ veniens Bruna de partibus Spaniae, ante cuius conspectum multae gentes peribunt’. Haec vero aequitum calcibus dirumpetur.” This foreshadows the notorious forty-second chapter, where her apprehension, her indictment for the murder of ten Frankish kings and her subsequent execution are described. Equally revealing is the

interpolation, as chapter 36 (made after 640), of a long excerpt from Jonas' *Vita Columbani*, which vividly portrays the stormy scenes between the queen and the savage old saint who refused to tolerate Merovingian polygamy.

If we analyse the last forty-two chapters of the chronicle for which no one questions Fredegar's authorship, we find that his subject-matter falls into fairly distinct groups. Six chapters deal predominantly with Burgundian affairs; five with Visigothic Spain and Gascony; six with Lombard Italy; six with Byzantium; thirteen with the general area of Austrasia and Germany; and the remaining six cover individual themes, such as the death of Dagobert at Saint-Denis, or the eulogies of Aega and Erchinoald, mayors of the palace. Their subject-matter overlaps, and they are of very unequal length; but they give some idea of proportion. Here, Fredegar is not searching wildly for any scrap of intelligence; he must have been in a position to select and to reject. In consequence, what he has left survives because he thought it important. He is able, without moving outside Burgundy, to give a vivid picture of what seventh-century Frankish politics were about, in Burgundy, Neustria, Austrasia and Aquitaine, and also to sketch in, spasmodically, the doings of neighbouring peoples, particularly as they affected the Franks. The picture is in this sense European, and it is a picture by no means entirely derived from hearsay. Fredegar's sources are difficult to distinguish because he was generally successful in recasting his information into his own literary mode. One often has the feeling of his subject-matter jumping all over the place but the same is seldom true of his style, which is episodic to a degree surpassing even Gregory of Tours. This gives the reader a first impression that he is dealing exclusively with saga-material and with scraps picked up in conversation; but one would not expect this of a man able to manage, however inexpertly, the difficult chronicles that form the bulk of his compilation, and in fact it is not true. To deny that oral sources play their part would be foolish; but they are not the whole story, or the part of the story on which he should exclusively be judged.

An example may be found in his chapters dealing with Byzantine affairs. There are six of them, some very long; and

five form a block on their own. To them we should add three other chapters interpolated in the chronicle of Fredegar's Burgundian predecessor. They contain long and obviously exaggerated stories, full of dialogue and movement, that somehow do give an authentic impression of such various topics as the Byzantine wars with Persia, Byzantine relations with Italy and Byzantine resistance to the Arabs. Chapter 9 describes how Caesara, the wife of the Persian Emperor Anaulf, fled to Byzantium in disguise and was baptized; and how, in due course, the conversion of all Persia followed. Paul the Deacon, who is not known to have used Fredegar, has the same story with less detail and in a different form.¹ There was no Emperor Anaulf, say the commentators. True, but the name sounds like a possible Germanic attempt at Anōsharwān, the Persian name for Chosroes I; and Chosroes did make some remarkable concessions to Christians in his domains; and the name of his Christian and favourite wife, Shīrīn or Sira, could conceivably become Caesara. Look, again, at Heraclius' relations with Dagobert, and at the long description of Heraclius' duel with Chosroes in chapter 64. Heraclius' weapon is an *uxus*, a word used once before by Fredegar (and only by Fredegar) in the sense of a sword or dagger; to Hellmann we owe the suggestion that the word is derived from the Persian *ākus*, meaning a chisel or a knife; Professor W. B. Henning, on the other hand, has pointed out to me that Fredegar's account may go back to the source of the Greek historian Theophanes, who writes that Chosroes was killed by arrows, *τοξοις*; and that *uxus* may reflect a corrupt and subsequently misunderstood *(τ)όξον*, or rather *(τ)όξα*.² In any event we seem here, too, to be in touch with an eastern Mediterranean tradition. Closely connected with the Byzantine chapters are the Italian; and here it was long ago realized that Fredegar must have made use of traditions that were independently available to Paul the Deacon; and these must, in part, have been literary, for the two writers have too much in

¹ *Historia Langobardorum*, Lib. IV, cap. 50 (ed. G. Waitz, p. 173). I am much indebted to Dr. J. A. Boyle for advice on Persian matters.

² A fuller statement of Professor Henning's views will be found in my edition of Fredegar.

common to allow of an oral source when one remembers that they were separated by a century and a half. I am inclined to wonder whether Fredegar may not have had access to a collection of historical material from Bobbio, which would explain not only much of his Lombard and Byzantine chapters but also material concerning Luxeuil and Austrasia that one immediately assumes to have come from Luxeuil itself, if not from some Austrasian centre such as Metz.

To take one early seventh-century sample of his Visigothic chapters, Fredegar tells (IV, 33) of a *dux* named Francio who had conquered Cantabria in the days of the Franks and had long paid tribute to their king ; but when the province turned to the Empire the Goths seized it. This rigmarole has never arrested the attention of historians, knowing as they do that the Franks never controlled Cantabria. And yet there was a *dux* Francio, a Byzantine *magister militum* who ruled over the *territorium* of Como until he was forced by the Lombards to flee to Ravenna. This was *circa* 588. Paul the Deacon talks about him.¹ The identification of the two is not out of the question.²

Fredegar's information about Austrasia and its problems is copious, but lacks, I think, clear evidence of direct observation. He is unable, for example, to give any reasoned account of Dagobert's great judicial tour of Burgundy (which, incidentally, is the perfect answer to the question "what were barbarian kings meant to do when they were not fighting"), an account based, one might hazard the guess, on personal knowledge. The tour ends up in Paris, where we learn that his chief advisers, at least on Austrasian affairs, were Arnulf of Metz and Pippin : "regebatur ut nullus de Francorum regibus precedentibus suae laudis fuisset precellentior". The Austrasian March against the Slavs and Wends appears to be held without the Austrasians feeling that they were, so to say, merely holding the fort for the rest of the Franks. Then comes a sudden change. Paris seems to have been too much for Dagobert and the result (ch. 60) is a total collapse of morals ; he surrounds himself with wives and

¹ Ibid., *Lib.* III, cap. 27.

² The possibility is discussed by G. P. Bognetti, *Relazioni X Congresso Int. di Sci. Stor.*, iii. 41.

mistresses, starts robbing the churches and forgets all the justice that he had loved before. The Austrasians become restive and appear to put the blame on Pippin (ch. 61), though Fredegar here uses obscure language and one cannot be quite certain who is blaming whom. What is certain is that Fredegar himself is in a muddle; and I suggest that the reason may lie in his use of two distinct sources, the first Burgundian and the second perhaps Austrasian. He goes on to depict Dagobert's increasing difficulties with his eastern March, including the rebellion of Radulf, his duke in Thuringia (ch. 77), and the war against Samo, the extraordinary Frankish adventurer who went on a business trip to the Wends and stayed to be their king (chs. 48 and 68). Fredegar is our first informant on the Western Slavs, the Slavs more particularly of the present area of Czechoslovakia. Without him we should be nowhere, and his information on Slav politics and society is notably reliable.¹ One may, in passing, note that in chapter 48 (a late interpolation) Fredegar remarks that the Wends, before they were liberated by Samo, were subject to the Huns or Avars, who used them as *Befulci*. What were *Befulci*? Fredegar explains: they were mercenaries who were sent into the front line by their masters to bear the brunt of the attack; which is a reasonable gloss on *befulti*. Chaloupecký thinks that the word is a hybrid, *bis*+*folc*, "a double regiment". But, as Theodor Mayer has plausibly shown,² Fredegar gives the right explanation of the wrong word. What the Wends actually did was to look after the Avars' herds of buffalo, and hence in their own language would have been known as *Byvolci*, the people who looked after the buffaloes (*byvolû*); and the nearest Latin homophone known to Fredegar was *befulti*, or *befulci*, on which he proceeds to comment. So here again it looks as if he were in touch with a direct source of foreign intelligence and is not just romancing. (There are, in

¹ V. Chaloupecký, "Considérations sur Samon, le premier roi des Slavs", *Byzantinoslavica*, vol. xi (1950), gives a résumé of the important studies of the Polish scholar, G. Labuda. Dr. E. B. Fryde has since informed me that he is not entirely persuaded by Labuda's evidence, which is archaeological, that Samo led the Slavs of Moravia.

² "Fredegars Bericht über die Slawen", *Mitteilungen d. Öst. Inst. f. Gesch.*, erg. bd. ii (1929).

fact, two other instances of his misunderstanding Slav words but doing his best with them.)¹

In chapter 75 Fredegar recounts how Dagobert gave to the Austrasians his little son Sigebert, as king, and established him in Metz with a suitable treasure and under proper tuition. Why did he make this concession? The answer is "deinceps Austrasiae eorum studio limetem et regnum Francorum contra Winedus utiliter definsasse nuscuntur": the Austrasians, for all that they hate Dagobert, will now be prepared to stand against the Wendish raiders on their eastern March. So times have changed. This view of Dagobert, and before him, of his father Chlotar, deliberately encouraging the autonomy of the Austrasians as their only barrier against the Slavs, has recently been attacked by Dr. Eugen Ewig² and others. Yet it appears to be borne out by *Lex Ribvaria*, a skilfully-constructed collection of Frankish and other law codified in the seventh century from one possible motive only: to placate and bind closer to the Merovingians the people to whom it would apply—the Franks of the region of Cologne, a particularly difficult sector of the threatened Rhineland³ to which the Merovingians had devoted special attention and from which a Frankish advance north towards the Lower Rhine was planned and in part only carried out. It shows signs of having been put together by Burgundian lawyers; and we know that both Chlotar and Dagobert were much influenced by Burgundians. But all that is outside my present subject. It only suggests again that Fredegar has tapped an authentic Austrasian source. He had no great sympathy for Austrasians

¹ *Gagano* in the same chapter, and *Walluc* in chapter 72. Is it possible that the same word *G(h)aganus* (= Khan) has also troubled Eddius, and that we should read *Kagano* for *pagano* when he writes *sub pagano quodam rege Hunnorum degens* (*The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus*, edited by Bertram Colgrave (1927), ch. 28, p. 56)?

² "Die fränkischen Teilreiche im 7. Jahrhundert", *Trierer Zeitschrift* (22. Jahrgang, 1953), p. 113; "Die Civitas Ubiorum, die Francia Rinensis und das Land Ribuarien", *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter*, xix (1954), especially pp. 23-7, an admirable survey to which I am much indebted; K. A. Eckhardt, *Pactus Legis Salicae* (1954), pp. 119-20.

³ *Lex Ribvaria* has been re-edited by F. Beyerle and R. Buchner, M.G.H., *Leges*, vol. iii, pt. 2, (1954). I have discussed some of the political implications of the text, and of the editors' views, in *English Historical Review*, lxx, (1955), 440-3.

but he knew where to find out about them and was always prepared to have a guess at their motives.

We come, finally, to Fredegar's two concluding chapters (89 and 90). They are the longest of his own composition, and also the vividest. The first tells how the Frankish regent, queen Nantechildis, went to Orleans in Burgundy, and summoned to her all the Burgundian *seniores*, lay and ecclesiastical, and with their approval appointed Flaochad, *genere Franco*, to be their mayor in succession to Aega; and the second goes on to tell how Flaochad, once appointed, looked for an opportunity to destroy an old enemy, the Burgundian patrician, Willibad. They meet, at last, outside the walls of Autun, and Willibad is killed. The count of the palace, Berthar, a Transjuran Frank, was, writes Fredegar: the first of them all to attack Willibad; and the Burgundian Manaulf, gnashing his teeth with fury, left the ranks and came forward with his men to fight Berthar. Berthar had once been a friend of his, and now said, "Come under my shield and I will protect you from danger", and he lifted his shield to afford cover to Manaulf. But the latter struck at his chest with his lance, and his men surrounded Berthar, who had advanced too far, and gravely wounded him. But when Chaubedo, Berthar's son, saw his father in danger of his life, he rushed to his assistance, threw Manaulf to the ground, transfixed him with his spear, and slew all those who had wounded his father. And thus, by God's help, the good boy saved Berthar, his father, from death. Those dukes who had preferred not to throw their men upon Willibad now pillaged his tents and the tents of the bishops and the rest. The non-fighters took a quantity of gold and silver and horses and other objects.

Pierre le Gentilhomme, the numismatist, plausibly associated Willibad's scattered treasure with coins discovered at Buis (Saône-et-Loire ¹)—more plausibly than Baudot associated Berthar with the authorship of the chronicle on the strength of his performance on this occasion. But it is fairly clear that Fredegar had personal knowledge of, and interest in, what happened. He goes on to relate that Flaochad died eleven days after Willibad, "struck down by divine judgement . . . many believed that since Flaochad and Willibad had sworn mutual friendship in places holy to the saints, and had both greedily oppressed and robbed their people, it was God's judgement that delivered the land from their overweening tyranny: their faithlessness and deceit were the cause of their deaths." So ends the chronicle. Fredegar does not say that he believed this, though he probably did.

¹ *Mélanges de Numismatique Mérovingienne* (1940), p. 105.

What he gives no indication of is a clear-cut fight between the Burgundian aristocracy and the Frankish intruders. The cross-currents were, in fact, much more complicated. Both the patrician and the mayor were out to feather their own nests, and both had Franks and Burgundians, laymen and churchmen, in their followings. In fact, this precisely illustrates the point made in the story about Basina ; when " lesser beasts " reign, there will always be a scramble for local influence.

Fredegar had known and understood some of the " greater beasts ". It is because of him that we know anything of the detail of the great reign of Dagobert I. But Fredegar had an equally high opinion of Dagobert's father, Chlotar II, the executioner of Brunehildis. These two men, Chlotar and Dagobert, were masters of the Frankish scene for twenty-five years between them. After them came a minority and the rule of mayors. Fredegar did not think, or say, that this meant the end of the Merovingians or of Frankish Gaul ; but he does show, in the remaining three years of his chronicle, what the clash of uncontrolled local interests meant in practice. In this, as in much else, our whole approach to the central period of the Merovingian age is unconsciously based on Fredegar's approach ; we simply cannot avoid it.

When all is said and done, Fredegar is not a Gregory of Tours. He is less learned and more easily muddled, though it is always to be remembered that his work is incomplete. Nor is he the associate of kings. But he is equally vivid with his stories, and the stories do illustrate a consistent approach to events ; and further, they do involve personal judgments. He is not perhaps, as he stands, a historian, though, had he ever finished, he might have written that *Historia Francorum* which I incline to think Gregory never intended to write ; but he is a major adapter of other peoples' chronicles and a major chronicler in his own right. One cannot fail to be struck by the contrast between the political chaos and vendetta of seventh-century France, of which Fredegar himself is in large part our evidence, and the patient skill with which this remote figure builds up his complicated record of events. Surely he deserves serious re-assessment, and higher rank among the writers of the Dark Ages ?

A DATED TENTH CENTURY HEBREW PARCHMENT FRAGMENT FROM THE CAIRO GENĪZAH IN THE GASTER COLLECTION IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY¹

By M. WALLENSTEIN, M.A., PH.D.

SENIOR LECTURER IN MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HEBREW IN
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

THE parchment fragment under review which, as we shall see, is of interest to the historian on the one hand and to the student of the various systems of vocalization on the other, has Hebrew writing on both sides. It measures $6\frac{3}{10} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ inches, the *recto* containing a colophon and the *verso* some fragmentary verses of the first chapter of Jeremiah.

RECTO. The colophon² comprises 11 lines which are fairly legible except for a few faint or distorted words in each of the first few lines. The few small lacunae in the other lines are easily restorable. Its margins, which are embellished in a primitive manner with lines and some symbols,³ are extensively

¹ The following article forms, with some alterations, part of a lecture delivered at the Second World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem on 28 July 1957.

² The copyist does not seem to have followed here the more familiar practice of giving information on the end page. (For the various positions of colophons in ancient Hebrew manuscripts, cf. Strack-Harkavy *Catalog der hebräischen Bibelhandschriften der Kaiserlichen Öffentlichen Bibliothek in St. Petersburg*. The Leningrad MS. B 19 A, which served as the basis for *Biblia Hebraica*, for instance, has its colophon—copied in full in Strack-Harkavy's catalogue, i. 265—on the opening leaf. Professor Kahle was good enough to draw my attention to this fact.) This is suggested by the *verso*, but see what follows. From the fragment it is not clear, however, what was the order of the Later Prophets here. The possibility of having again here the less familiar practice of starting with Jeremiah instead of with Isaiah (see Bābā Bathrā 14b. See also I. Ben-Zevi . . . שבנה'כ הקראיים . . . "מקדשה" in *Kirjat Sefer*, xxxii. 366-7) is somewhat reduced by the two faint letters, which look like *sāmekh* and *hē*, recorded on the left-hand side of the bottom margin of the colophon, for these letters may well indicate the number of this particular page in the original codex. The perusal of lines 2-3 and the first word of line 4 in the colophon reduces still more this possibility.

³ The scheme is as follows: Two parallel lines run through the right and left bottom borders. The top border is confined by a single line, edged all round

mutilated. This is especially true with regard to the right margin.

The following is the transcription followed by a translation :

אני סהלאן [?????]]
 [תי ארבעה]
 ספרים [חצי הנביאים]
 האחרונים בקרתה גיפה יהי
 רצון מלפני צורי שיזכני] 5
 להגות בהם אני ובניי ונקיים
 בה לא ימוש ונחזה קיום
 [הנחמות החקוקים באילו
 הספרים ונכתב בשנת שמונה
 מאות ושמונים ושש שנה 10
 הרחמן יבנהו בימינו אמן

“ I, Sahalan []¹ have []² four books³
 [] half (?)⁴ of the Later⁵ Prophets in the town
 Gaifa.⁶ May it be the will of my Rock to make me and my
 children⁷ worthy of studying them, thus performing “ It
 shall not depart.”⁸ May we be also worthy of seeing the

with angular lobes, on the middle of which are superposed crudely drawn triple triangles one set within the other. A vertical line has been placed to the left of this figure, to the left of which, again, there are a few indistinct symbols.

¹ Here come six indecipherable letters, the last four of which, however, look like חנפש.

² For the likelihood of the restoration here of כתבתי, see further discussion about the identity of Sahalan.

³ The original shows the word ספרים clearly. On photographing, however, the piece of parchment curled up, face inward.

⁴ This word is split horizontally into two parts which, if joined together, seem to read the above Hebrew equivalent.

⁵ In the original, unlike in the photograph, the Hebrew equivalent of this word appears quite clearly.

⁶ In Arabic the G is a *ghain*, i.e. Ghaifa.

⁷ Note the orthography ; the “ i ” sound being rendered by two *yōdhs*. This is also the case with regard to the word that follows it as well as with that of line 4. This orthography is prevalent in many Genīzah fragments dating mainly between the ninth and the twelfth centuries, a practice which the Hebrew Language Academy in Israel is at present endeavouring to revive in unvocalized texts.

⁸ The reference is to Jos. i. 8, where we read “ This book of the law *shall not depart* from your mouth, and *you shall study it* day and night ”. These words in full or in an abridged form are common in colophons found in manuscripts of Hebrew codices of the Bible.



Colophon, containing date A.D. 954.



Verso of the above fragment, containing text of Jer., i. 1-12.

fulfilment of [the] comforts which these books embody.¹

And it was written in the year eight hundred and eighty six.

May the All-merciful rebuild it² in our days. Amen."

There are a few interconnected particulars arising out of the colophon. Taking the copyist first. The manuscript, after the Hebrew equivalent of "I, Sahalan", has, as shown in note 1, p. 552, some indecipherable letters. Following come the letters תי which appear to be the suffix of some Hebrew verb. A variety of apt verbs in this context leaps to one's mind, the most apt being the verb כתב "to write", since Hebrew colophons beginning with "I . . . have written" and embodying in one of their other lines the word וכתב, or ונכתב, as is the case in our colophon (see line 9), are quite common.³ The copyist then might well have been a person called Sahalan.⁴

Now, there are numerous records of Jews named Sahalan who flourished in the Babylonian community of Fustāt (Old Cairo) when it was ruled by the Fāṭimid Caliphs, beginning with A.D. 969. We know of a Sahalan whose son Abraham served as the spiritual head of the Babylonian community in Fustāt in the second half of the tenth century and the beginning of the eleventh century.⁵ Further, from Abraham's genealogy, which has been preserved, we learn that Sahalan *Rôsh Hassēder* and *Rôsh Kallah*, a contemporary of Solomon b. Yehūdah, succeeded his father Abraham as head of the Babylonian community.⁶ There is also a record of Sahalan *Hammumḥeh* b. Abraham *Hammumḥeh* who might have been the grandfather of Sahalan *Rôsh Hassēder*.⁷ Was the person with whom we are concerned Sahalan *Hammumḥeh*

¹ Lit. "which are engraved . . .". Note the masculine instead of the feminine. The reference is to the comforts of Zion which the Later Prophets proclaim.

² Viz. the Temple. See further discussion about the date later in the article.

³ Cf. e.g. Mōsheh b. Asher's colophon as produced by P. Kahle in *The Cairo Genīzah*, p. 111.

⁴ It is true that at first sight the handwriting of the colophon looks somewhat different from that of the Jeremiah verses copied on the *verso*. But this apparent difference is likely to be due to the greater care taken by the copyist to copy a Biblical text, to which he intended, as it would appear, to apply the double system of vocalization—both Babylonian and Tiberian—along with a great number of other signs.

⁵ See J. Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine Under the Fāṭimid Caliphs* (= Mann), i. 96-7.

⁶ See Mann, i. 97.

⁷ See Mann, i. 97.

or at least one of the members of his family? Probably. It is a pity that the manuscript is damaged following the name Sahalan. A few particulars, however, emerge quite clearly from the manuscript. The Later Prophets, or part of them, were written by an experienced scribe in the town of Gaifa in the year 886. From the words "May the All-merciful rebuild it in our days" (bottom line) which follow the date one may pretty safely say that the date refers to the destruction of the Temple.¹ It was thus written in A.D. $886 + 68 = 954$, namely only about fifty-nine years later than the earliest (except, of course, the Biblical texts found recently near the Dead Sea) known Biblical codex—that of Mosheh b. Asher² containing the Former and Later Prophets.³

As to Gaifa (with, as it would appear, the alternative forms of Gaitha or Gaita)⁴—a village in the immediate vicinity of Bilbais (or Bilbeis) in the Sharqīya to the north east of Cairo—the following non-Jewish sources are of interest.

(a) ". . . from al-Farma to a village called Jurjir is one stage and from this place to a village called Faqus it is one stage, and from here one goes on to a village called Gaifa. . . ." ⁵

(b) "As regards Hawf (name of region) its fortified citadel is Bilbais. Among the towns of this region are Mashtul, Jurjir, Faqus, Gaifa, Dabqu, Tuna, Barrim, al-Qulzum." ⁶

It is significant that Muqaddasī, who died c. A.D. 1000 and was therefore a contemporary of our Sahalan, should call the place "town" (*medina*), whereas Ya'qūbī, who died in 897, calls it "village" (*qaria*).

¹ The counting according to the destruction of the Temple is not uncommon in various Genīzah documents of the Middle Ages.

² See Kahle, *op. cit.* p. 57.

³ Here is the place to note that numerous fragments of Biblical codices of apparently earlier dates were found in the Cairo Genīzah which belonged to a synagogue founded in the year 882. However, actually *dated* fragments of the tenth century seem to be very few.

⁴ See Maqrīzī, *El-Mawā'iz wa'l-I'tibār* (Cairo, 1922), iii. part 2, p. 223. The editor, G. Wiet, indicates in a foot-note that four manuscripts have the reading Gaifa. For this note as well as for the information about Gaifa from non-Jewish sources I am indebted to Mr. J. D. Latham of the Manchester University Library.

⁵ See Ya'qūbī, *Kitāb al-buldān* (Leiden, 1892), p. 330.

⁶ See Muqaddasī, *Descriptio imperii moslemici* . . . (Leiden, 1877), pp. 193-4.

It may well be that in the tenth century Gaifa attained some importance through its proximity to Bilbais, which is mentioned as a place where the Fāṭimid Caliph 'Azīz died and which became a town of considerable strategic importance at the end of the Fāṭimid period. It should be noted, too, that Bilbais was a stage on the road from Syria to Cairo. It is likely that the fortunes of Gaifa were closely linked to those of Bilbais.

I have been unable to glean any information about the existence of a Jewish community in Gaifa in the Fāṭimid Caliphate period. However, evidence of a Jewish community in its neighbouring town Bilbais is seen from a number of related Genīzah fragments,¹ and it stands to reason that with the growth at that period of the Babylonian Jewish community in Egypt in general and in Fustāṭ in particular at the expense of the dwindling Jewish community in Babylon, the former spread also to Gaifa. It may further be assumed that if there existed a vigorous Jewish population in Gaifa in the tenth century it would have contributed to the growth and development of this place so as to convert it from its rank as village to that of town. It is interesting to note that the designation *qarta* given in the colophon to Gaifa (line 4) tallies well with the term *medina* given by Muqaddasīq.

VERSO—that of the other side of the colophon—contains parts of Jeremiah i. 1-12. It is divided into two columns, the column on the right (= α) being more damaged than that on the left (= β). Each column seems to have originally contained nineteen lines minus one blank line. In α the blank line comes after verse 4 and in β after verse 10.² Both columns have their top two lines, except for part of the last word of the second line of α , as well as their last three lines missing. The eighth line in β shows the following []ם ועל הממל[]ע³ and only the upper half of most of the letters in line 16 is preserved in β .

The text is supplied with full Tiberian vowels, accents and

¹ See Mann, ii. 259, n. 7; 317; 327; 329.

² In Biblia Hebraica following verse 4 there is the letter *sāmekh* and following verse 10, the letter *pē*.

³ Cf. its corresponding line in the *recto*.

horizontal strokes above the *begadhkephath* letters to indicate *rāphē*.¹ The poor state of some words in the text makes it rather difficult to examine minutely all the diverse signs. However, it seems pretty safe to say that in respect of vowels (with one exception ?),² accents, *maqquēphs*, *rāphēs* and orthography there does not seem to be any deviation from the Masoretic Bible as illustrated by, for example, the *Biblia Hebraica*, in common with more or less other accepted editions of the Hebrew Bible of today.³ As regards the *methegh*, however, it does not follow, so far as one can detect, those found in various editions of the Hebrew Bible, many of which are mainly based on the Ben-Hayyim text. In this respect, however, it is in conformity with the *Biblia Hebraica*. Here, for example, there is no *methegh* before the *heth* of *החמישי* (α line 10) or before the *hē* of *ולהרוס* (β line 10), both of which are vowels with composite *shewa*.⁴ In the case of the diacritical point of the *shīn* it is, unlike the more accepted printed Bibles of today, placed on the right hand of its second stroke (cf. e.g. α , lines 8 and 10 ; β , line 4). Here again it is in conformity with the *Biblia Hebraica*.

More difficult to examine, on account of indistinct signs, are the Babylonian vowels (= B) which accompany the Tiberian vowels (= T). It is not, for instance, entirely clear whether the *full* B system of vowels is employed. By subjecting lines 8 and 13 of α to a close examination, we may get some idea of the way this system is displayed here. It may also throw some fresh light on T.

¹ The material with which we deal being scanty no instance of *rāphē* in the case of *gīmel* and *pē* are extant.

² Viz. the vowel under the *lāmedh* of *ולנחור* (β line 9) which looks a pale *pathah*. Note, however, its B *hīreq*.

³ The word *מקל* (β line 14) has, it is true, no *dāghēsh* in the *qōph*, but the hollowness of its leg developed in the course of time suggests a similar case with regard to its *dāghēsh*. As to the vowel under the *mēm* of *מה* (β line 13), though it looks like a *pathah* it is in reality a *qāmēs*; there is a dot under the small horizontal line (for such is the form of the *qāmēs* in our manuscript, which, by the way, indicates antiquity) which is, however, merged into the right hand side of the Babylonian *pathah* superposed between the *mēm* and the *qōph* of line 14, this part of the vowel looking somewhat deeper than various parts of other vowels in the manuscript. For similar shape of the *qāmēs*, cf. lines α , 13 ; 14.

⁴ See Gesenius-Kautzsch, 16 f.

Line 8. שנה¹ *shīn*—the diacritic point to the right hand side of its second stroke; the T *qāmēš* but not the B one.² Nun—both the T and B(?) *qāmēš*; the T disjunctive accent *zāqēph qāṭōn*.³ לצדקיהו. *Lāmedh*—the T and the B(?) *shewa*.⁴ *Zadē*—the T and B *hīreq*.⁵ *Dāledh*—Both T and B(?) *Shewa*.⁶ *Qōph*—the T and B(?) *hīreq*.⁷ *Yōdh*—sharpened by *dāghēsh*; the T and B(?) *qāmēš*; ⁸ conjunctive accent *Merekha*.⁹ The last syllable, *hu*,—the T *shūreq*. Above the *hē*, a small diffused letter.

Line 13. בבטן.¹⁰ *Bēth*—T and B *pathah*; horizontal stroke above it; (Second) *bēth*—*dāghēsh*; T *seghōl* and B *pathah*. *Tēth*—T *seghōl* and B *pathah*. Final *nūn*—*pashtā*. ידעתך. *Yōdh*—T *shewa* and B *hīreq*.¹¹ *Dāleth*—both T and B *pathah*; horizontal stroke. 'Ayin—T *shewa* only. *Taw*—*dāghēsh lene*; T and B¹² *hīreq*; T *zāqēph gādōl*. *Yōdh*—see preceding n.; B *zāqēph*.¹³ Final *kaph*—both T and B *qāmēš*; 'athnah(?)

With regard to the handwriting, after a close examination of the original manuscript, I have come to the conclusion that the

¹ Preceding this word is part of the *hē* of עשרה of Jer. i. 3.

² For the slanting stroke directed towards the diacritic point of the *shīn* but mainly resting over the roof of the *hē*, cf. the strokes over *hē*'s in similar positions at ends of words in S. Pinsker's *Mabhō'el ha-Niqqudh ha-'Ashshūrī* . . . , p. 57.

³ This is superposed slightly to the right of the *nūn*, due no doubt to the B *qāmēš* (accent ?) above it.

⁴ Is the *shewa* (a horizontal line above the respective letter; cf. e.g. the line above the *qōph* of הקדשתך (a line 14)) partly merged into the roof of the *lāmedh*?

⁵ A dot above the *šādhe*. For a similar B *hīreq*, cf. the dot above the *he* of *a*, line 14.

⁶ It may also indicate the *rāphē*.

⁷ The B, *hīreq* which seems to be on the top of the left hand side of the *qōph*, is fainter than other *hīreqs* in the manuscript.

⁸ It seems to be partly erased.

⁹ This *Merekha*, unlike the other *Merekhas* in the manuscript which are drawn slightly slanting to the left (cf. e.g. the one under the *heth* of בחדש, a line 10), is drawn here perpendicularly, due no doubt to the space which the T *qāmēš* of the *yōdh* occupies.

¹⁰ Preceding are the final *kaph* and part of the *resh* of אצורך (cf. Jer. i. 4), the *resh* showing its B *shewa* and the final *kaph* its *qāmēš* of both T and B.

¹¹ Do we have a similar case in the *yōdh* of יהודה (a line 9), the B *hīreq* of which, however, being faint? In this respect the B *hīreq* of the *wāw* of וְלֵהָאבִי (β line 9) is of interest.

¹² This is placed above its following *yōdh*.

¹³ Above it there are two perpendicular dots which belong to its preceding line, indicating the end of verse 4 of Jer. i.

Jeremiah text as also its double vocalization, etc., were the work of one and the same hand. The various strokes, lines and touches embodied in the letters and diversified signs exhibit the same style. This is also true with regard to the colophon (see n. 4, p. 553). The ink, which displays the same shade of hue and the identical density of colour throughout the whole of the manuscript, supports this conclusion.¹ It is, therefore, quite plausible to conjecture that the copyist supplied simultaneously both T and B vocalization along with the other symbols, being aware that his sons, living as they did in the middle of the tenth century when the Tiberian masoretic system was already well established, as well as amidst the Babylonian community which must have retained many Babylonian traditions, were in need of both types of vocalization. If this conjecture is right, the data which may be gathered in respect of pronunciation is obvious.

¹ I am indebted to Professor Z. Ben-Hayyim, of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, who has examined with me the handwriting of the original manuscript. He concurs with my opinion.